

Me first!

Neal | [Email](#) | [Homepage](#) | **12.31.04 - 12:02 pm** | <#>

As for Washington, it is dissapointing and Republicans should exhaust all legal methods to try to come to the most honest conclusion in that state.

However, Republicans should not fret if Gregoire becomes Governor. We know how to get even. Just watch. Revenge is sweet.

Corey | [Email](#) | [Homepage](#) | **12.31.04 - 12:07 pm** | <#>

Corey, so if Rossi should use every legal tool in WA should the Democrats do the same in that NC race?

Steve | [Email](#) | [Homepage](#) | **12.31.04 - 12:11 pm** | <#>

sure, I had not heard anything about the NC race before this.

However, the apparent margin in that race in favor of the Republican is much much much higher than Gregoire's apparent margin over Rossi.

If they do a re-vote in NC, I bet Troxler wins.

Corey | [Email](#) | [Homepage](#) | **12.31.04 - 12:14 pm** | <#>

Seems to me the fair thing to do is just let the 4000 or so voters whose ballots werent counted revote if they are capable of being identified.

Cynical Cid | [Email](#) | [Homepage](#) | **12.31.04 - 12:20 pm** | <#>

BTW GO MONTANA DEMS!!!!!!

Steve | [Email](#) | [Homepage](#) | **12.31.04 - 12:22 pm** | <#>

umm... after 3 recounts not two.... no wait make that after 4,5,6,7,8 "recounts".... as many times as the democrats found "extra" ballots in the corners of voting places throughout King County

blahblahblah | [Email](#) | [Homepage](#) | **12.31.04 - 12:24 pm** | <#>

Washington race:

- (1) Election night initial count.
- (2) Statewide machine recount.
- (3) Statewide hand recount.

That's all the counts that took place in that race.

Steve | [Email](#) | [Homepage](#) | **12.31.04 - 12:26 pm** | <#>

The initial "Election Night count" in Washington lasted for about two weeks.

That just adds to the perception that counties such as King were trying to drag it out as long as possible in order to figure out a way to change the outcome.

Elections in Washington are a complete mess and are sadly an embarassment to the state. There is no way that the entire process should still be going on.

Just have a special election and whatever the results are, both sides should abide by.

If Democrats feel that Gregoire got more votes and since they apparently feel that Rossi is now the one acting like a sore loser and angrying the state, they should not have a problem with Gregoire being sworn into office in January and then having another election in February or March.

Corey | [Email](#) | [Homepage](#) | **12.31.04 - 12:36 pm** | <#>

angering, what kind of word is angrying? What is wrong with me?

Corey | [Email](#) | [Homepage](#) | **12.31.04 - 12:40 pm** | <#>

I'm just wondering about the 527 voters in King that listed their home addresses as being the County office building...

I am glad to see that all the legal actions will be taken to make sure each vote counts.

It should only go that way.

In Washington, in Montana, North Carolina and any other state. Democracy itself is at issue.

If we can't have fair, free elections, it makes it difficult to convince the world that we can hold free fair elections in Iraq - or anywhere else for that matter.

I realize that it is almost impossible to convince everyone that we did our best to count each vote and to treat each vote equally and thereby arrive at a result that reflects the will of the people, but we need to do our best to try.

That means allowing "everyone the opportunity to vote" AND counting all the votes that are "legitimately cast, by registered voters". We do that, and most democrats and republicans will be satisfied.

This goes for all elections, everywhere... Washington, Montana, North Carolina.... Afghanistan, Iraq.... and maybe even someday in Ohio.

All this aside, I think I am most impressed that according to the Exit Polls, Americans are voting on Moral Values, more than any other issue. George and John spent \$2.2 billion dollars with hate adds, etc.. but in the end, morals won out.

Of course, I am trying find the moral equivalency in giving \$35 million to the worst catastrophe in my lifetime, while spending \$2.2 billion to "convince" less than 1/2 of our population to participate in democracy....

\$2.2 billion, divided by the number of families displaced would probably put them back to where they were before the quake (remember how poor this people are).

We spent that much trying to decipher the difference between a blue-blooded New Englander with a Yale education and a blue-blooded New Englander with a Yale education.

I am all for democracy. I want people to be informed, and I want every vote to count. At the end of the day, there will be blue states and red states, satisfied voters and those who feel disenfranchised, and at the end of the day, you'll have the United States Government, fully functional, making 1/2 of us happy and half of us sad.

But at a certain point, on a human level, you have to see the injustice of this all.

Anonymous | [Email](#) | [Homepage](#) | **12.31.04 - 1:00 pm** | <#>

Whats wrong with you Americians !!
Can't you do simple things like counting properly

Mark Goodair | [Email](#) | [Homepage](#) | **12.31.04 - 1:25 pm** | <#>

any thoughts on the upcoming 06 senate races?

dems will win sometime | [Email](#) | [Homepage](#) | **12.31.04 - 1:58 pm** | <#>

A revote would be stupid, not to mention unfair, in other words, I fully expect N.C.'s Right Wing Supreme Court to authorize one. Bev Lake never met an opportunity to be a partisan douchebag he didn't take.

Congrats to Gov. Gregoire. It's great to see Republicans squirming and weaseling so openly. They don't have the sufficient proof to meet WA's requirements.

Go Dems in Montana, now find a way to send that lying, pledge breaking moron Burns back home.

tom jefferson | [Email](#) | [Homepage](#) | **12.31.04 - 2:00 pm** | <#>

Yes, DWWS. The Republicans will pick up 3 seats.

emale73 | [Email](#) | [Homepage](#) | **12.31.04 - 2:01 pm** | <#>

Corey, Gregorie won fair and square, get used to it!

Here in NC, however, I think the Dems should concede this one, much as I hate to see them get another seat on the Council of State here. Cobb would need 80% of those lost votes in Carteret Co, and he got only 40% there and most of the missing votes are registered Republicans, so the chances of him winning are miniscule.

See I want my party to play fair, you simply want your party to win every race. That's the difference b/w me and you, son.

paul falduto | [Email](#) | [Homepage](#) | **12.31.04 - 2:08 pm** | <#>

In other more election follow-up, the Montana Supreme Court

tsk, tsk, Ron --poor grammer is the devils playground.

I know Howard Dean is taking credit for this and other local Red state wins -- including in central TX.

But the thing in TX was against Tom DeLay and something tells me the Democrat leadership and the big Liberal donors had something to do w/it.

MT vote 60% for Bush, and a Const. Party guy was almost in the legislature.

So I think thats mainly a local dissenchanted with the GOP machine

dudeman5685 | Email | Homepage | **12.31.04 - 2:12 pm** | <#>

paul, I do not know much about what had been going on in this NC race before now, and your analysis clearly leads me to believe the Republican should be seen as the winner.

As for Washington, the margin between the two candidates is incredibly smaller than the margin in the NC race, and there has just been too much stuff that has taken too long in that state for anyone to be confident about the results.

However, I do realize that while Gregoire might be recalled, there is not going to be a re-vote most likely.

Republicans should just smile and get on with things and realize that we will get even in due course.

Corey | [Email](#) | [Homepage](#) | **12.31.04 - 2:12 pm** | <#>

See I want my party to play fair, you simply want your party to win every race. That's the difference b/w me and you, son.

Tell that to the boring as hell VP who tried to steal Florida in 2000.

What was his name?

dudeman5685 | Email | Homepage | **12.31.04 - 2:14 pm** | <#>

dudeman, FL was an entirely different situation. Gore was right to contest it, he should have pushed harder from the beginning. That one was stolen by the GOP, in my opinion.

paul falduto | [Email](#) | [Homepage](#) | **12.31.04 - 2:24 pm** | <#>

Gregorie will not be recalled.

paul falduto | [Email](#) | [Homepage](#) | **12.31.04 - 2:25 pm** | <#>

Corey, the REPUBLICAN Sec of State certified the results. Yet you all are still crying about it? Earth to GOP: you have a SLIGHT advantage in this country now, but that doesn't entitle you to every office!

paul falduto | [Email](#) | [Homepage](#) | **12.31.04 - 2:28 pm** | <#>

I am far from crying about it.

I am the one who said that if once all legal options are exhausted and Gregoire is the winner, than we should just smile and go about getting revenge through the ballot box in 2006 and 2008.

Democrats would be the ones talking about blood in the streets and general strikes, etc.

Corey | [Email](#) | [Homepage](#) | **12.31.04 - 2:32 pm** | <#>

Washington is a step closer to being able to elect our own Governor with Dino Rossi's calling for a new election. Gregoire knows this election was a mess, but she doesn't want a re-vote because she would lose. In a re-vote, Rossi will win with about 53% of the vote.

Glad to see a new re-vote in North Carolina as well.

Ron, a few mistakes in your artical:

- 1) Gregoire won with 129 votes, not 130.
- 2) Dino Rossi is not a state senator, he is a former state senator.

Kyle | [Email](#) | [Homepage](#) | **12.31.04 - 2:33 pm** | <#>

dudeman, FL was an entirely different situation. Gore was right to contest it, he should have pushed harder from the beginning. That one was stolen by the GOP, in my opinion.

Grant it, there where many irregularities, but after a month of recounts with Bush ahead, don't you thnk Gore should have conceded and not of let that thing even get to the courts?

Know when your ahead, know when your behind, and sacrifice a little ego for the good of the country.

dudeman5685 | [Email](#) | [Homepage](#) | **12.31.04 - 2:33 pm** | <#>

You know what all this proves?

COMPUTERIZED ELECTION DIDN'T DO A DAMN THING TO HEL THE PROCESS.

There have only been more disputes since they were introduced

To think-- a few years ago people were advocating voting online.

I think we can all now agree that that would be a disaster.

dudeman5685 | [Email](#) | [Homepage](#) | **12.31.04 - 2:36 pm** | <#>

dudeman, I agree online voting is a bad idea, but the Washington election has proven that computerized elections are much better then the old way of counting by hand.

Kyle | [Email](#) | [Homepage](#) | **12.31.04 - 2:39 pm** | <#>

I assume Chris Gregoire will appoint Dino Rossi as co-governor and the two would both be Governor. Why? Well, when Dino Rossi won with 261 votes, Gregoire said she and Rossi were "tied". When Dino Rossi won with 42 votes, she said they were still "tied". Now that Gregoire is ahead by 129 votes, what does that make it in her own words? Oh yeah, a "tie", according to her. Put your money where your mouth is Gregoire!

Kyle | [Email](#) | [Homepage](#) | **12.31.04 - 2:41 pm** | <#>

No fair! Republicans lost in Montana! Contest the race! Block the Statehouse! The GOP must win at all costs! It isn't fair! WAHHHH!!

paul falduto | [Email](#) | [Homepage](#) | **12.31.04 - 2:42 pm** | <#>

kyle, Rossi didn't "win" by 261 and 42. He led in the vote counts. Gregorie won by 130 after the final recount, certified by the REPUBLICAN Sec. of State! Get over it, your Dino lost!

paul falduto | [Email](#) | [Homepage](#) | **12.31.04 - 2:43 pm** | <#>

Wow Paul, you really dont understand that race in Montana. There was never any issue with the Republican running for that house seat. He came in third and lost badly.

Kyle | [Email](#) | [Homepage](#) | **12.31.04 - 2:43 pm** | <#>

And if Rossi had won by 130 and been certified the winner, you think he'd be calling for a revote? PUHLEZZE! You guys are living in some dream land.

paul falduto | [Email](#) | [Homepage](#) | **12.31.04 - 2:45 pm** | <#>

Paul, your wrong.....again. Rossi was certified the winner of the election weeks ago. Do your homework bro.

Kyle | [Email](#) | [Homepage](#) | **12.31.04 - 2:45 pm** | <#>

kyle, I understand perfectly what happened in MT: the Dems won big. My post about that was satire, making the point that you GOP whiners can't seem to accept defeat.

paul falduto | [Email](#) | [Homepage](#) | **12.31.04 - 2:46 pm** | <#>

Doubt it, because had he again, there wouldnt have been all the major problems showing up in King County.

Kyle | [Email](#) | [Homepage](#) | **12.31.04 - 2:46 pm** | <#>

Paul, I never have commented on Montana. If that Constitution guy lost, oh well, nothing seams to be wrong there now.

Kyle | [Email](#) | [Homepage](#) | **12.31.04 - 2:47 pm** | <#>

kyle, how could Rossi have been certified the winner before the hand recount? You should do your homework (which as a high school student I imagine you have) and leave politics to we adults. When you're able to vote, chime in, kiddo.

paul falduto | [Email](#) | [Homepage](#) | **12.31.04 - 2:47 pm** | <#>

Paul, you need to know what you are talking about before you go spewing out your crap on this board. Rossi was certified the winner after the first re-count. Why? Because a third count is not required by state law and no one had asked for one at the time of certification BECAUSE, no one can ask for a third count until after the certification.

Kyle | [Email](#) | [Homepage](#) | **12.31.04 - 2:51 pm** | <#>

Something tells me that wasnt really Paul.

Kyle | [Email](#) | [Homepage](#) | **12.31.04 - 3:01 pm** | <#>

No fair! Republicans lost in Montana! Contest the race! Block the Statehouse! The GOP must win at all costs! It isn't fair! WAHHHH!!

Paul--go back to the Ukraine

dudeman5685 | [Email](#) | [Homepage](#) | **12.31.04 - 3:01 pm** | <#>

Typically "WAHHHH" is a liberal term.

As in "WAHHHH" he has more stuff than I do

or

"WAHHHH" those people on the billboard arn't the same color as me

or "WAHHHH" I don't have FREE housing, medicine, higher education, utilities, bongo drums.....shouldn't those be human rights?

dudeman5685 | [Email](#) | [Homepage](#) | **12.31.04 - 3:05 pm** | <#>

Flash: Rep. Patrick Kennedy (D-RI 1) announced yesterday that he will NOT seek the Senate seat now occupied by Lincoln Chafee (R) who comes up for reelection in 2006.

Rep. Kennedy isn't eager to lose seniority in the House: he's now on the Appropriations Committee. I have to say I'm glad I don't have to face the prospect of Sen. Patrick Kennedy now (maybe, as he said, in ten years when he knows more, but by then he may in the majority caucus) but that's dampened by the knowledge that he'll be my Congressman for the indefinite future.

Both Kennedy and Sen. Jack Reed (D) are mumbling about Rep. James Langevin (D-RI

2), the fourth member of RI's Cong'l delegation, challenging Chafee in 2006. I think Langevin would be a weak, uninspired candidate. He's done little of note in Congress although he can be a powerful voice from his wheelchair for stem-cell research (cf. his introduction of Ron Reagan at the Dem. Nat'l Convention). He can do this particularly effectively because (unlike most Rhode Islanders) he is pro-life and not pro-choice.

However, that may be the issue that sinks him in either the primary or the general election, since Sen. Chafee is pro-choice. In 2000, many Democrats and liberals (including my mother) went over to supporting Chafee when the Democratic primary voters nominated Rep. Robert Weygand who was pretty liberal (though not dramatically so) but pro-life. I thought (as do many reactionary Republicans in D.C.) that the letter after Chafee's name would prove more important in such a closely-divided Senate, and I haven't yet been proven wrong.

The other leading potential Democratic candidates, former U.S. Att'y & R.I. Att'y-Gen. Sheldon Whitehouse (who lost the 2002 Gubernatorial primary to Myrth York, who lost to Republican Don Carcieri in November) and Secretary of State Matt Brown (who? many would rightly ask) don't sound like formidable competition for someone in so strong a local position as Sen. Chafee. Whitehouse may try again for Governor in 2006, which is probably a surer bet. If Brown wants to do more than establish a name for future campaigns, he might also be wiser to look at the Governor's chair.

Dem Socialist Dave | Email | [Homepage](#) | 12.31.04 - 3:06 pm | <#>

kyle, fine, Rossi was "certified" the preliminary winner. But if that was that, why was the third recount allowed? You're playing semantic games here. If Rossi "won" why did REPUBLICAN Sam Reed certify Gregorie as the winner?

And what wasn't me? Those are all my posts.

paul falduto | [Email](#) | Homepage | 12.31.04 - 3:07 pm | <#>

I believe that in the legalities of the Washington election process, Sam Reed had certified Dino Rossi as the winner and after the hand recount was not a continuation of the process but a reversal of the outcome.

Is this the right chronology?

Corey | [Email](#) | [Homepage](#) | 12.31.04 - 3:10 pm | <#>

Paul, a third re-count is allowed by state law. I don't know why, but it is, I didnt write the laws. And thank you for somewhat admitting you were wrong.
Sam Reed certified the election because thats his job. The only person that can dump the

election is the state house and senate members or the state courts. Sam Reed can not.

And Im sure that was your posts above, but Im sure you are not the regular Paul Falduto trhat posts on this board.

Kyle | [Email](#) | [Homepage](#) | **12.31.04 - 3:10 pm** | <#>

Yes, true Corey.

Kyle | [Email](#) | [Homepage](#) | **12.31.04 - 3:12 pm** | <#>

Democratic Socialist Dave, I would like as A marxist, I wonder what you have to say about this...

Beavis and Butthead do Marxism--

In 2004 an English professor told a college sophomore to free write for 30 minutes. This is the result.

Beavis and Butt-head are cool. They spoke for the inner frustrations of a generation. Beavis was the son of a flower child and a soldier on 2 month 30 day leave from Vietnam. Butt-head was the illegitimate son of Gov. Bill Clinton. They met in March 1992 at a conference on nuclear power in Berkeley, CA. At the time Beavis was an engineering major and Butt-head was in his first year of pre-med. Both were involved in the anti-war movement. Although the war had ended almost 20 years beforehand, activists were still protesting that we had ever gone. Then a stroke of genius hit Butt-head -- the two would start a TV show in which two people sat on a couch and and commented on whatever the world showed them. He meant for the show to be a biting indictment of post-industrial capitalist society. Beavis agreed, and suggested they use music videos as the main conduit of critical observation of the oppression that middle class white males in a first world country had to endure. The show was an incredible success. It showed millions around the world the alienation that the system produces in todays youth. As Beavis and Butt-head sat watching cable television in a house were you never saw any parents, or any one pay any bills, you could literally smell the anger that these yuth felt. As they constantly ate tacos and nachos, and were on a never ending quest for sluts and beer, you could see the solidarity that these people felt for women and oppressed minorities in the United States. And in their never realized dream of joining the cool gang, we see the alienation that capitalism produces between man and man. By 1997 their work was done; they had revealed their radical message for millions around the world, and the world would never be the same.

Not bad for something off the top of my head, eh?

dudeman5685 | [Email](#) | [Homepage](#) | **12.31.04 - 3:13 pm** | <#>

From the Seattle Times:

As has been the case since Election Day, much of the attention is focused on King County. Republicans are asking questions about why the county's list of registered voters who cast valid ballots in the election shows about 3,500 fewer people than the total number of votes certified in the race.

Kyle | [Email](#) | [Homepage](#) | **12.31.04 - 3:15 pm** | <#>

It really doesn't matter, the Sercetay of States affiliation Paul.

By your logic the election was "stolen" when the SEcState certiyed the first guy winner, then UN-STOLEN when the same guy, blonging to the same pary certified the other dude.

Its just a formaliy. It doesn't raly matter, like the electoral college.

dudeman5685 | [Email](#) | [Homepage](#) | **12.31.04 - 3:15 pm** | <#>

Whatever the chronology, whatever the terminlogy, Gregorie is the next Governor of WA. Get used to it.

And it is I, the "regular" Paul Falduto. Is there an "irregular" Paul Falduto? If so, he stole my email address too!

paul falduto | [Email](#) | [Homepage](#) | **12.31.04 - 3:15 pm** | <#>

Now Sam Reed's office is sending offical investigators to King county.

Kyle | [Email](#) | [Homepage](#) | **12.31.04 - 3:16 pm** | <#>

Whatever the chronology, whatever the terminlogy, Gregorie is the next Governor of WA. Get used to it.

BOUT THE SAME CHRONOLOGY AS FLORIDA 2000, eh?

But the GOP won that, so it must be stolen by an evil corporate-fundamentalism-racist-pro-kitten killing conspiracy.

dudeman5685 | [Email](#) | [Homepage](#) | **12.31.04 - 3:17 pm** | <#>

From *The Providence Journal*

Kennedy skipping run for Senate

The congressman, first elected to the House in 1994, says "I've worked hard to get to where I am."

01:00 AM EST on Friday, December 31, 2004

BY M. CHARLES BAKST
Journal Political Writer

PROVIDENCE -- U.S. Rep. Patrick J. Kennedy yesterday took himself out of consideration for the 2006 Democratic nomination for Senate and said he'd support U.S. Rep. Jim Langevin for the nod if Langevin wants it.

In deciding whether to try for the Senate seat held by Republican Lincoln D. Chafee, Langevin said, "I'm going back and forth."

Langevin said Democratic Sen. Jack Reed had encouraged him to make the bid. Reed did not deny that but said it is Langevin's decision to make. Asked whether Langevin is his first choice for the slot, Reed said, "I don't have a first choice at this point."

At least two other prominent Democrats, former Attorney General Sheldon Whitehouse and Secretary of State Matt Brown, also are eyeing 2006 Senate runs. Whitehouse also talks of running that year for governor, an office that eluded him in 2002 when he lost to Myrth York in a primary.

The decision by Kennedy, 37, to skip the Senate race was no surprise. First elected to Congress in 1994, he has been a tireless campaigner for his party, accumulated seniority and, most important, won a seat on the House Appropriations Committee, which plays a key role in spending decisions.

Kennedy yesterday phoned The Journal to say that his House service was "paying off" for Rhode Island and it's best that he keep at it. Kennedy, who called Appropriations "the most powerful committee in the Congress," declared, "I've worked hard to get to where I am. I'm in the groove."

He said he meets regularly these days for serious discussions with members of Rhode Island's business establishment who in his first congressional campaign were skeptical he'd accomplish anything in Washington. Kennedy was a Providence College student

when initially elected to the Rhode Island General Assembly in 1988. Running for Congress in 1994 at age 27, he was still routinely called The Kid. He defeated a tough Republican opponent, Kevin Vigilante, and has cruised to reelection ever since.

Kennedy asserted that his Appropriations seat enables him to channel an extra \$100 million to Rhode Island every year, two-thirds of it in defense spending at Raytheon and other companies. The rest, he said, goes for items as diverse as band instruments for East Providence students or a health project in Woonsocket.

Asked whether he was forever ruling out the idea of running for Senate, where his father, Sen. Edward M. Kennedy, of Massachusetts, has been a legend, the congressman said it was hard to see, say, a decade down the line. By then, he said, he would have accumulated even more House clout. In fact, he mused, "I'll be in the majority." So far in his career there, the Democrats always ha

Anonymous | [Email](#) | [Homepage](#) | **12.31.04 - 3:19 pm** | <#>

Not the real Paul Falduto, Gregoire will be the Governor, unless the state over turns it or a new election is held. Rossi can become Governor by three different ways now:

- 1) Re-vote
- 2) Court declares Rossi the winner
- 3) State house and senate declares Rossi the winner.

Kyle | [Email](#) | [Homepage](#) | **12.31.04 - 3:19 pm** | <#>

Patrick J. Kennedy made a smart choice, he would have lost had he run for the Senate.

Kyle | [Email](#) | [Homepage](#) | **12.31.04 - 3:21 pm** | <#>

[From *The Providence Journal* **Kennedy skipping run for Senate**, continued]

Asked whether he was forever ruling out the idea of running for Senate, where his father, Sen. Edward M. Kennedy, of Massachusetts, has been a legend, the congressman said it was hard to see, say, a decade down the line. By then, he said, he would have accumulated even more House clout. In fact, he mused, "I'll be in the majority." So far in his career there, the Democrats always have been in the minority.

Kennedy said he told Langevin that if he wants to try for Senate, he'd back him "100 percent."

Langevin, first elected to Congress in 2000, is 40. He said yesterday that he has been

working on armed services, homeland security, health care and education issues and has been rising in seniority. He said the question is whether he could be more effective in those areas in the Senate.

He said he will be intensifying his conversations with Rhode Islanders next week and also wants to meet with Senate Minority Leader Harry Reid and Sen. Charles Schumer of New York, chairman of the Democratic Senatorial Campaign Committee.

"I hope to make a decision, I'd say, within the first few months of this new year," Langevin said. That may seem early to some people, but Langevin said it would take a pile of money to win the Senate seat, and "I would have to get started."

Rhode Islander Reed said his role in talking with Langevin was to give advice. He said he told him that the race would be "challenging, difficult, demanding." Reed said any race against an incumbent who works hard and is well financed is tough. (Actually, Chafee isn't guaranteed of being the GOP nominee; he may have a primary.) But Reed also praised Langevin's talent and record and noted that Rhode Island regularly votes Democratic for president and that Democrats hold three of the four seats in the state's Washington delegation. "It's got great potential for a Democratic candidate," he said.

Meanwhile, J.B. Poersch, who is Reed's top aide but is about to become executive director of the Democratic Senate campaign unit, said he was "disappointed" that Kennedy won't run. He'd have made a "great" candidate, Poersch said, but he added that Langevin would be "fine" and Whitehouse or Brown would also be "very good."

Poersch said he thinks things may fall into place quickly. "I wouldn't be surprised if we found a candidate against Senator Chafee sooner rather than later," he said.

Dem Socialist Dave | Email | [Homepage](#) | **12.31.04 - 3:21 pm** | <#>

dudeman, it wasn't a conspiracy that stole the 2000 election. It was stolen right out in the open.

paul falduto | [Email](#) | [Homepage](#) | **12.31.04 - 3:23 pm** | <#>

It's amazing that Corey continues to spout nonsense about the Washington situation when I've educated him about it numerous times in the past.

First, it takes many weeks after election day for all counties to certify their initial counts because ballots need only be postmarked by Election Day. You cannot count the votes if they aren't there. Washington voters are quite used to this.

Second, Gregoire will not be recalled. It takes 35% of the electorate to sign a petition, plus allegations of malfeasance while in office. If you think 35% is easy (after all, >48%

voted against her) think again; it takes only 8% to get an initiative on the ballot, and it's not easy to get an initiative on the ballot.

Kyle, I don't see that computerized elections help in the case of recounts. Only if they provide a paper trail, in which case you get to recount just like paper ballots. You are spared decisions about over and under votes, but presumably the write-in votes still have to be combed for people who, for example, chose to write in Gregoire or Rossi.

The problems with computers are they have this tendency to do things like in NC, where votes are swallowed without notice. This wouldn't be a problem if they had the paper trail. Note that even if they don't swallow votes, without a paper trail, a recount is nonsensical. The computer said it was 250 to 230 the first time. What does a recount even mean if all you have is a tally? If the computer gives you a different result the second time through, that's reason enough to think the machine is flaky, and then you're in a situation like the people in NC where all the votes cast by the machine have to be thrown out.

A final problem with computers is that you can't use them to vote absentee, and it's clear that an increasing number of Washington State voters love to vote absentee (I know I do). All schemes proposed so far to use the computers to vote remotely are horribly, horribly flawed.

MN_Bulldog, the voters who listed the Courthouse at the residence were homeless voters. This is quite legal. As a side-note, if you do not have a permanent residence, you have to vote in person (no absentee voting allowed).

Paul, I do believe Rossi was certified the winner after the machine recount. In fact, I think someone had to be certified before the Dems could pay for the hand recount. But I think this just shows that 'certified' doesn't mean what people are trying to make it mean. Just as Rossi's certification could be overturned by the subsequent hand recount, Gregoire's could be overturned as a result of an election protest. At this point, though, I'm dubious that will occur.

By the way, if anyone cares, I think Gregoire was right initially: 261, 42, and yes, 129 are all ties. The election machinery is simply not accurate enough to say with certainty that the 'winner' with those margins was the one who got the most votes.

Of course, the question is, now that

Greg in Seattle | Email | Homepage | **12.31.04 - 3:23 pm** | <#>

kyle, 1, 2, or 3, it ain't goin' to happen for your Dino. But, hey, Corey says voters in WA will be so enraged that they kick Dems out of every office at every level and keep them out for 50 years or more, so you should be happy!

paul falduto | [Email](#) | [Homepage](#) | **12.31.04 - 3:25 pm** | <#>

(continued; guess I'm too long-winded today)

Of course, the question is, now that you know that, what do you do? Maybe the fair thing in something like a presidential race is to just split the electoral votes if there's a result within the margin of error for a particular state. But you can't split the governor's office. Well, I guess you could, but I know that's not going to happen.

One final note: through this whole process, one person has been clearly correct all along: Secretary of State Sam Reed. He's been on the winning side of every court case. He's been a voice of reason when Ds or Rs were calling the other side cheaters. Listen to him. Right now he basically says, "Gregoire's the winner, and as far as I can see the election was counted fairly. But with a margin this close, if I were Rossi, I'd definitely be looking to make sure everything checks out."

Greg in Seattle | [Email](#) | [Homepage](#) | **12.31.04 - 3:27 pm** | <#>

Greg, machines aren't biased. When you have situations such as in King County where the canvassing board came across a ballot with a write in vote. This write in vote was for "Christine Rossi". Instead of giving this vote to someone named Christine Rossi, or rejecting it, they gave it to Chris Gregoire! That's horrible and sick they would do such a thing.

Kyle | [Email](#) | [Homepage](#) | **12.31.04 - 3:27 pm** | <#>

Greg in Seattle, I understand your point about "certified" and I'm sure someone did have to "certify" the results at each point. But that doesn't mean they were "certified" the next Governor, which I assume is what you are saying in different words, and if so, I agree with you. Kyle, Corey, Dudeman and others somehow think this means the election was "stolen." I certainly can't follow that logic.

paul falduto | [Email](#) | [Homepage](#) | **12.31.04 - 3:28 pm** | <#>

I agree, Kyle.

Were a Kennedy in the race, all those Republican wallets that are understandably reluctant to open for someone as liberal as Chafee would suddenly open very wide. Out of state Republicans already send lots of money to Kennedy challengers like Dr Kevin Vigilante (1994) and former USN SEAL Dave Rogers (2002 & 2004); with Chafee they have someone who's already shown he can actually win a Rhode Island election.

On the other hand, with Rep. Langevin (whom I consider to be very weak) pro-life Republicans would be in a quandary similar to pro-choice Democrats': would they send money to help a pro-choice liberal Republican incumbent defeat a pro-life, relatively-moderate Democratic challenger?

Dem Socialist Dave | Email | [Homepage](#) | 12.31.04 - 3:29 pm | <#>

Not the real Paul, I wouldn't say that, it's still early for Rossi to pull out one of those three options. And I don't care if all the statewide offices went for Republicans, I rather have a Governor people elected, or at least be sure they elected that person.

Kyle | [Email](#) | [Homepage](#) | 12.31.04 - 3:30 pm | <#>

kyle, I agree, let's take away that vote for "Christine Rossi" about which you have posted about 42 times now. So Gregorie won by 128. What's your point?

paul falduto | [Email](#) | [Homepage](#) | 12.31.04 - 3:32 pm | <#>

Paul, not that it matters very much, but Christine Gregoire doesn't spell her name Gregorie.

(But perhaps you should keep your spelling to show you're not being spoofed by some impostor.)

Happy New Year to you and everyone else.

Dem Socialist Dave | Email | [Homepage](#) | 12.31.04 - 3:32 pm | <#>

Paul, Rossi was certified the Governor of Washington, live with it. Now Gregoire is certified the Governor of Washington, but with new problems arising, include the one I just listed above, her election is in major doubt. I never said the election was stolen, not once.

Kyle | [Email](#) | [Homepage](#) | 12.31.04 - 3:32 pm | <#>

Dem Dave, do you think Chaffee will face a major Republican primary?

Kyle | [Email](#) | [Homepage](#) | 12.31.04 - 3:34 pm | <#>

kyle, if Rossi was certified Governor, why isn't he taking the oath of office? Sorry, he

was "certified" the "winner" in PRELIMINARY counts and the FINAL count showed those two PRELIMINARY counts to be wrong. That is why Gregorie will be taking the oath, not your Dino.

paul falduto | [Email](#) | [Homepage](#) | **12.31.04 - 3:35 pm** | <#>

I've been spelling it wrong all along, I guess, but however she spells it, she's the next Governor of WA. Will kyle move to Canada?

paul falduto | [Email](#) | [Homepage](#) | **12.31.04 - 3:36 pm** | <#>

Paul, he was certified as The Governor-Elect. But state law allows a third count if someone in race race asks for one. If the first results are over turned in the third count, then the winner of the third count then will become ceritifed Governor Elect. So tell me, what makes the third results right and the frist re0count wrong? Because Gregoire won the third count? Are you so partisenly blind that everythings fine if your guy, or in this case, woman, wins? Thats sad fake Paul.

Kyle | [Email](#) | [Homepage](#) | **12.31.04 - 3:39 pm** | <#>

Why would I move to Canada? I am not like one of those un-American liberals who are moving to Canada because Bush won.

Note I am only calling the liberals who are moving to Canada un-American, not liberals in general because I think the vast Majority of Liberals are pro-America and are patriots.

Kyle | [Email](#) | [Homepage](#) | **12.31.04 - 3:41 pm** | <#>

And if I were to move out of state, it would be to Oregon.

Kyle | [Email](#) | [Homepage](#) | **12.31.04 - 3:43 pm** | <#>

It's time that we all admit that our positions in this race are not based on any principles. They are based on partisan politics. I know mine are. I want Gregoire to win BECAUSE I'M A PARTISAN DEMCORAT. I don't want a re-vote BECAUSE I'M A PARTISAN DEMOCRAT. If there are any people here who *do* base their decisions on principles, whose positions in elections are consistent and disregard party affiliations, then I salute them. They are much better people than I. But I doubt that those people exist. It's pretty clear that we're basing positions on partisanship; let's just be honest about it.

MiniPundit | Email | [Homepage](#) | **12.31.04 - 3:45 pm** | <#>

Kyle,

It's certainly possible that someone, if only from principle, might challenge Chafee from the right, but a serious challenge that had any prospect of success is incredibly unlikely.

Rhode Island Republicans, from what I can tell, are split about down the middle. Some are almost as conservative as the mainstream national GOP (i.e. somewhat to the left of Geo. W. Bush) but many agree with the Chafees. Republican Governors like Lincoln Almond and Don Carcieri are good at pleasing both internal constituencies, since the right wing true-believers know that there's only so much they can do in such a Democratic state.

And the same would apply even more strongly to a Senate race. I doubt that (except maybe on the issue of abortions) many conservative R.I. Republicans want to take the risk. From their point of view, they would be risking almost certain defeat (as the Buckleys did with Lowell Weicker, R-Ct) in order to move from having their point of view heeded maybe 20-30% of the time to having it shut out completely by the likely Democratic victor.

Of course, Lincoln Chafee may anger the White House or national Republicans so much that they'd finance a challenger, but it would be futile locally and only work as some kind of self-punishing warning similar to the treatment delivered to Sen. James Jeffords (Ind, ex-R, Vt). If Chafee survived, as he most likely would, his independence would only be strengthened.

Dem Socialist Dave | Email | [Homepage](#) | **12.31.04 - 3:45 pm** | <#>

Note Gregoire said a new election shouldnt be held because it would cost the tax payers alot of money. She says this even though Gregoire's third count costs the tax payers almost a million dollars.

Kyle | [Email](#) | [Homepage](#) | **12.31.04 - 3:46 pm** | <#>

i think if the white house produced a real conservative alternative in rhode island that chafee would seriously consider switching parties, it's not like it is unheard of to do so

dems will win sometime | Email | [Homepage](#) | **12.31.04 - 3:48 pm** | <#>

Dave, interesting. Whats your take on your Governors race at this point in 2006?

Kyle | [Email](#) | [Homepage](#) | **12.31.04 - 3:49 pm** | <#>

Mini, I support the re-vote in North Carolina because I think the Democrat won that race, or at least there is major problems that arised that puts the Republican's victory in major doubt.

Kyle | [Email](#) | [Homepage](#) | **12.31.04 - 3:50 pm** | <#>

Anyways Im out of here. Later Dave and fake Paul.

Kyle | [Email](#) | [Homepage](#) | **12.31.04 - 3:54 pm** | <#>

In fact, the effect of a Republican primary challenge to Sen. Lincoln Chafee (RI) would be upon the general election.

It might weaken Chafee in facing a Democratic challenger, but it might also strengthen his liberal-moderate credentials. (I doubt that he'd have to lurch far, far to the right in order to defeat a Republican primary challenge. On the other hand statements he made during a primary campaign to reassure the Republican faithful might be useful ammunition to the Democrat.)

And no one knows as of now what the Democratic primary campaign, if any, will be like. Robert Weygand and Joseph Paolino did weaken each other in the 2000 Dem. Senate primary. The same happened when Sheldon Whitehouse and Myrth York competed in the 2002 Dem. guberantorial primary.

Dem Socialist Dave | [Email](#) | [Homepage](#) | **12.31.04 - 3:54 pm** | <#>

Kyle, the reason the third count is more 'right' than the second (and why the second was more right than the first) is because errors in the previous counts (like the 700-odd King County ballots that were wrongly rejected in the first two counts) are corrected in the subsequent ones. So subsequent counts are more believable than the previous ones. Your arguing that the second count is just as good as the third is nonsense logically and legally.

Also, your note about the Christine Rossi vote (a story I haven't seen confirmed anywhere, but let's just take it as an interesting hypothetical) does not, as I said before, show a difference between computerized voting and non-computerized. Computerized systems must allow for write-ins, ergo someone can still write in (or is it type in?) 'George W. Kerry' or 'Christine Rossi' or whatever. And then it's still up to the canvassing board to decide what, if anything, to make of this. Computerized voting cannot remove the human element from elections.

Greg in Seattle | Email | Homepage | **12.31.04 - 4:02 pm** | <#>

"Note Gregoire said a new election shouldnt be held because it would cost the tax payers alot of money. She says this even though Gregoire's third count costs the tax payers almost a million dollars."

That's only because the recount overturned the results. The democrats already fronted the money, and were prepared to pay.

What irritates is how hypocritical Rossi is coming off. Did he call for a revote when he is ahead by a margin of 42 votes? Rossi lost, Gregoire won, it's over, and a revote or a court battle would damage the state much more than it would help it.

Mark from Olympia | Email | Homepage | **12.31.04 - 4:04 pm** | <#>

I'm heading out to catch the last sunbeams of 2004, myself, but I think that a White House inspired primary challenge to Chafee would impel him to leave the GOP only if he were headed in that direction anyway.

He has no credible competition in the RI GOP (they feel lucky to have elected a Republican Senator five times in a row, for 30 years of service, in such a Democratic state), but he would have in the Democratic Party, where he would be on the right-hand edge. Becoming an Independent unless he really had to would just mean having an opponent taking away part of his conservative vote. I don't know grassroots Republican sentiment, but I would be surprised if there's very much sentiment to repudiate Chafee, who, even apart from questions of electability, is far more popular among RI Republicans than the present White House or Congressional leadership. A campaign to get closer to Bill Frist is not a vote-winner here.

What would Texas or Louisiana Democrats have said had Clinton's White House decided to punish Charles Stenholm or John Breaux by supporting liberal challengers in the Democratic primary?

Dem Socialist Dave | Email | [Homepage](#) | **12.31.04 - 4:05 pm** | <#>

kyle, you read the NC results wrongly, the GOP candidate is ahead, not the Dem.

paul falduto | [Email](#) | Homepage | **12.31.04 - 4:09 pm** | <#>

kyle, the Dems PAID for the third recount! Yes, they get it back because they WON and that's the law. Why do you seem to have a problem following the law?

paul falduto | [Email](#) | [Homepage](#) | **12.31.04 - 4:10 pm** | <#>

I simply cannot believe this!

House considers weakening ethics rules
Change could make it harder to discipline lawmakers
Friday, December 31, 2004 Posted: 1:47 PM EST (1847 GMT)

WASHINGTON (AP) -- Republican leaders are considering a change in House ethics rules that could make it harder to discipline lawmakers.

The proposal being circulated among House Republicans would end a general rule against any behavior that might bring "discredit" on the chamber, according to House Republican and Democratic leadership aides.

House members would be held to a narrower standard of behavior in keeping with the law, the House's rules and its ethics guidelines.

paul falduto | [Email](#) | [Homepage](#) | **12.31.04 - 4:15 pm** | <#>

Well, Paul, don't you remember how the GOP campaigned against the outrageous scandalous Democrat practice of overdrawing cheques on their own accounts!

Aren't you so glad that someone Moral wants to restore Ethics and Values to That Mess in Washington?

Dem Socialist Dave | [Email](#) | [Homepage](#) | **12.31.04 - 4:27 pm** | <#>

And it gets worse, Paul. Another of the proposed rules would not allow a split Ethics Committee vote to go any further without the consent of both political parties. Currently a split vote on a complaint sends it to an investigating subcommittee. It's like giving the defendant the option of stopping any further retrial when a jury has hung.

See the fuller story in The Washington Post.

Dem Socialist Dave | [Email](#) | [Homepage](#) | **12.31.04 - 4:31 pm** | <#>

I commented on this yesterday. The Republican leadership is all peeohd at Ethics Committee Chairman Joel Hefley(R -Colo.) because the panel issued a mild rebuke To Tom Delay. Ironically one of the big issues that Gingricjh and the GOP used against the Democrats in 1994 was lax ethical rules. Maybe history is repeating itself?

Cynical Cid | [Email](#) | [Homepage](#) | **12.31.04 - 4:32 pm** | <#>

I hope that Cobb wins and I think he has a chance. As for the other reaces, the Democrats won for shure.

Chris Brown, Proud Democrat | [Email](#) | [Homepage](#) | **12.31.04 - 4:35 pm** | <#>

Like Lincoln, our first Republican president, we intend to act "with firmness in the right, as God gives us to see the right." To restore accountability to Congress. To end its cycle of scandal and disgrace. To make us all proud again of the way free people govern themselves.

— *The Contract with America*, 1994

Dem Socialist Dave | [Email](#) | [Homepage](#) | **12.31.04 - 4:44 pm** | <#>

Dem Socialist Dave | [Email](#) | [Homepage](#) | **12.31.04 - 4:45 pm** | <#>

The hand recount didn't cost the tax-payers any money did it? I thought it had to be paid for by the party requesting it, and the Dems paid for it. Why would you move to Oregon Kyle? Gov. Kulongoski is probably the most liberal governor in the nation. Despite a tight race, he still won by something like 3%. OR was also one of the few states to increase its Dem margin from '00 to '04.

VCUMIKE | [Email](#) | [Homepage](#) | **12.31.04 - 4:57 pm** | <#>

Yea, the Cobb/Troxler thing looked fishy. Personally, I don't give a damn, but things looked weird.

BTW, any Neo-Cons who support a revote in Washington but say a revote in Florida is just Dems whining, get over yourself, hypocrite. I think Dino lost Washington, but, what the hell, if he wants a revote, let him have it. Gregorie won, and she should let the revote happen. Troxler should do the same, and so should Dubya.

Ragnar Danashold | Email | Homepage | **12.31.04 - 5:04 pm** | <#>

Demo Socialist Dave-

Did you like Beavis and Butt-head do Marxism?

dudeman5685 | Email | Homepage | **12.31.04 - 5:18 pm** | <#>

On that, I don't think Dubya legitimately won. It sounded like that when I reread it. Here...

Did Kerry really win? Yes.

Did Cobb really win? Purhaps.

Did Dino really win? I don't think so, but mabey.

Ragnar Danashold | Email | Homepage | **12.31.04 - 5:22 pm** | <#>

Dems win Montana's State Goverment as well as Colorados. I think its quite clear the West is slowly shifting towards the Democratic party. 15 years from now and we'll have an electoral lock up.

Illinois-Liberal | Email | Homepage | **12.31.04 - 5:32 pm** | <#>

Last time I checked, Colorado had a Republican Governor who was reelected in a landslide. President Bush won the state by a wider margin than most anticipated.

President Bush won 59 percent of the Montana vote in 2004.

Local issues regarding state government have very little do with appeal on the federal level.

Democrats had a good year on the local level in Montana because of the unpopularity of Gov. Martz.

It was absolutely no indication that they can be competitive in that state on the Presidential level. Elections for Governor, state house, etc, vary widely in many states than who the voters choose to send to Washington DC.

Republicans control state legislative chambers in many states that are solidly Democrat on the Presidential level and I do not consider that an indication that a Republican will be carrying the electoral votes of such state.

Democrats got pasted in Montana in the Presidential race as they did in many of the Mountain West states and that does not look likely to change any time soon.

Corey | [Email](#) | [Homepage](#) | **12.31.04 - 5:39 pm** | <#>

Im a Democrat and a true liberal...

as such I feel the need to speak out when I see anyone abusing our system of Democracy.

Below is a News item found at a left leaning political site I often frequent (Dcpoliticalreport.com). I think its quite clear the GOP has every right to fight the election of Gregoire.

"Christine Gregoire (D-WA) was officially certified as the governor-elect of Washington after the first recount in state history to overturn the results. But Republicans might have found grounds to contest the outcome. King County, which provide Gregoire her 129 vote margin, released the list of registered voters who cast valid ballots, only to find that it was 3,539 less than the total number of votes certified in the race. "

DEMOCRATS DONT LOWER YOURSELVES TO THE NEW BUSH STANDARD!

Illinois-Liberal | [Email](#) | [Homepage](#) | **12.31.04 - 5:43 pm** | <#>

Corey: Youre correct about Colorado still having a GOP govenor but the Democrats did just sweep the house and senate (against expectations).

I stand by everything else I said. IT was the popularity of Sweitzer as well as the failure of the former GOP govenor that led to a Democratic sweep in Montana.

15 years from now the Democrats will have an electoral lock.

Illinois-Liberal | [Email](#) | [Homepage](#) | **12.31.04 - 5:48 pm** | <#>

Seattle voter fraud will go down in the record books, and I hope the entire nation hears of it.

The Democrats not only broke the law in doing a partial hand recount after two state-wide machine counts, they admittedly altered hundreds of King county ballots using white-out and permanent markers. They said they did it so voter intent could be more "clearly seen". Of course, voter intent will never be known on those altered ballots..

After Gregoire managed to scratch out a few more votes in this THIRD recount (after

Dino Rossi won twice and was declared the Governor elect), Dino asked for a list of certified voters list for King County. Turns out there are some 3,500 ballots with no certified voter on the list to vouch for them! Furthermore, 350 certified votes for Gregoire all gave the same home address...the address was the King County elections building. Another 250 all had addresses near by, and were not actual residences at all. The Deomocrats have been stuffing the ballot boxes like crazy.

The Democratic controlled canvassing boards also left out the military vote AGAIN in King and Snohomish county by delaying their absentee ballots until November 3rd. I can tell you that the deployed are pretty cheesed about that.

So, Rossi and 65% percent of the people polled want another election for Governor because this one is hopelessly compromised. But Gregoire says she won't have it, and since Democrats control both the legislature and the Supreme Court, this blatant fraud may actually stand.

WashingtondemturnedGOP | [Email](#) | [Homepage](#) | **12.31.04 - 6:05 pm** | <#>

Hehehe!!! ASU 27 Purdue 23!!!! Go Devils!!!

SunDevilCato | [Email](#) | [Homepage](#) | **12.31.04 - 6:27 pm** | <#>

Congrats Cato and Sun Devils.

The victory is a great tribute to the memory of Pat Tillman.

Texas Tech beating Cal-Berkely was pretty damn sweet on the whole conservative vs liberal scale.

Did I mention that my alma mater Northern Illinois also won a Bowl game?

Corey | [Email](#) | [Homepage](#) | **12.31.04 - 6:30 pm** | <#>

Actually it was a statewide hand recount, wdtp.

And, did you support a revote in Florida? I support a revote in Washington if the military vote really was left out, but for some reason I doubt it, considering your other errors.

liberalminded | [Email](#) | [Homepage](#) | **12.31.04 - 6:36 pm** | <#>

Liberals arn't made for Football.

Too "macho"

Too violent.

It disregards the environment.

Its racist because it tends to give credence to the stereotypical assumption that blacks are good at sports.

Liberals are more likely to like table tennis while listening to a Sarah McCallin record drinking mineral water

instead of sitting on you couch watching football with it's rock and country overture drinking BUCSH beer.

dudeman5685 | Email | Homepage | **12.31.04 - 6:52 pm** | <#>

liberal minded, I wasn't wrong, they were trying to force a partial hand recount of King County and as far as Florida is concerned, any ideas or assertions you have to believe that should have been revoted are just plain lies.

the vote turnout was depressed because the networks called Florida for Gore 1 hour before the polls in the panhandle closed and Gore never led the popular vote once. Then entire night ever. F

Fox news wasn't the first media channel to call it for Bush.

The Supreme Court of Florida literally broke the law by extending the voting deadline. Bush won the count, recount and third recount of targeted democratic counties. The SCOTUS literally created new policy that was unconstitutional.

The Supreme Court Unanimously said they had no right to do that.

By a count of 7-2 they said it violated the establishment clause

By a count of 5-4 they said there was nothing Gore could do.

Then the Dems were screaming to suppress the military ballots while claiming they were so stupid they couldn't vote on a butterfly ballot that were in Dem counties approved by Dem chairpeople.

Of course, vindication is sweet. Jeb Bush trounced a "moderate" superstar Democrat by 200,000 votes only two years later when the entire liberal establishment was looking for revenge and George W of course romped with 300,000 votes.

Hmmmm. If all these "lowly" black people who were bullied and couldnt stand up for themselves and ederly morons who were to stupid to use a ballot were so angry this was their chance.

WashingtonDemturnedGOP | [Email](#) | [Homepage](#) | **12.31.04 - 6:55 pm** | <#>

DEMOCRATS DONT LOWER YOURSELVES TO THE NEW BUSH STANDARD!

I hate to seem juvenile but, you started it when you forced the Bush campaign to what four recount, before it went to the surpreme Court?

dudeman5685 | [Email](#) | [Homepage](#) | **12.31.04 - 6:55 pm** | <#>

did you even read what I wrote 'dudeman'?

BTW it does sound like Troxler pulled some shady stuff so I am glad North Carolina is having a re-vote.

Illinois-Liberal | [Email](#) | [Homepage](#) | **12.31.04 - 7:32 pm** | <#>

Thank God- Montana is safely back in Democratic control. After 4 years of Judy Martz, maybe Montana can return to it's glory days!!

Mark Pawelczak | [Email](#) | [Homepage](#) | **12.31.04 - 7:45 pm** | <#>

illinois, you read a small blurd about Troxler that doesnt even link him to wrongdoing and you have condemned him already.

That is the pathetic liberal way. You are the most unintelligent bunch of idiots around.

WashingtonDemturnedGOP | [Email](#) | [Homepage](#) | **12.31.04 - 8:11 pm** | <#>

NO RECOUNTS!

The Results are final. This ain't the Ukraine. If you win by one vote, then you win by one vote, dammit.

And Montana Democrats rule almost as much as Wyoming Democrats!

Happy New Year all!

DemoGog | [Email](#) | [Homepage](#) | **12.31.04 - 8:33 pm** | <#>

And for a great laugh, check out:

<http://www.ericblumrich.com/ihr.html>

DemoGog | [Email](#) | [Homepage](#) | **12.31.04 - 8:44 pm** | <#>

Hey DemoGog, I dont know if your online right now. But if you are, I found your email sitting in the archives at Rolling Stone. Do you go there?

SolsticeRG | [Email](#) | [Homepage](#) | **12.31.04 - 8:44 pm** | <#>

I heard Montana under Judy Martz was nothing more than IL under George Ryan, or Alabama under Don Siegelman. Must have been pretty bad.

SolsticeRG | [Email](#) | [Homepage](#) | **12.31.04 - 8:48 pm** | <#>

I honestly do not think there is a link between how a state goes locally and how it goes federally. Look at how many Republican States have Democratic Governors. Look how many Democratic States have Republican Governors. Ditto for statehouses.

Kyle | [Email](#) | [Homepage](#) | **12.31.04 - 8:55 pm** | <#>

Washington Voters go here!

www.revotewa.com

Kyle | [Email](#) | [Homepage](#) | **12.31.04 - 9:04 pm** | <#>

2004 Election in Redux for 2008:

John Kerry and John Edwards will be our next president and vice president. They have the capacity to lead America in the fight against terrorism and rebuild our credibility with the world. They have the capacity to build a strong society where everyone benefits, whether you are poor or rich, middle class or wealthy but especially the middle class, small business or big business but especially small business, and where your average worker fights for a rightfully earned and deserved paycheck.

They have the capacity to bridge the social divide between whether your white or

colored, man or woman, gay or straight, disabled or able-bodied, and they will fight to ensure that our children get the best promises of a good education starting at age 3 and ending at age 18. They will keep our promises to the nation's elderly, not waste away our defaulting social security on stock market accounts that will do nothing but plunder the system.

Those are the issues i care about, and i know i can trust John Kerry and John Edwards way more than George W Bush and Dick "halliburton" Cheney to implement them for the right people of society. The people that built this country into the country it is today, and the people that will fight for this country into the future, long into the future.

[A Blanchard](#) | [Email](#) | [Homepage](#) | **12.31.04 - 9:16 pm** | <#>

Darn.

Sorry guys i just guess i had a 2004 flashback. It is New Years Eve.

Four more years of one party/mainstream media propaganda rule. Will Democracy survive? Kerry concedes, Bush smirks. This isnt Halloween. It's a nightmare.

[A Blanchard](#) | [Email](#) | [Homepage](#) | **12.31.04 - 9:19 pm** | <#>

There was nothing we really could do. It was us versus the world, and the people chose the world.

[Maria L Watters](#) | [Email](#) | [Homepage](#) | **12.31.04 - 9:22 pm** | <#>

by the way, I dont care what happens to this governors race in washington state. Noone better mess with My Maria Cantwell. Shes the best senator in my lifetime, no matter how close it was the first time. And im not just saying that because we share first names. Im saying that because i really like the gal. Shes got to stay. She to me is like Demogog and Ben Nelson.

[Maria L Watters](#) | [Email](#) | [Homepage](#) | **12.31.04 - 9:26 pm** | <#>

Besides, Washington State already elected the more liberal senator of theirs. Patty Murray is the more liberal one. Maria Cantwell is slightly liberal, but still espouses a moderate set of policies.

[Maria L Watters](#) | [Email](#) | [Homepage](#) | **12.31.04 - 9:29 pm** | <#>

And she also happens to be a business woman. My father is a businessman, And there is

no way business people are hardly liberal. They are atleast centrist to moderate left and right, or else the more right wing ones are conservative in many different forms - whether it be religious right, paleoconservative, or neo-conservative.

Maria L Watters

Maria L Watters | [Email](#) | Homepage | **12.31.04 - 9:31 pm** | <#>

The 3,500 'missing votes' in King County, are likely just undervotes or rejected ballots.

This is just the Republican Party grasping for any straw they can find, and there are none to be found.

They have every right to look of course. But, it does show Mr. Rossi for the hypocritical sleaze he is, given that when he was in the lead he was saying how important it was for the state to have the election over.

Adam T | [Email](#) | Homepage | **12.31.04 - 9:33 pm** | <#>

Maria Cantwell and Ben Nelson are both toast in 2006.

James Ervin | [Email](#) | Homepage | **12.31.04 - 9:33 pm** | <#>

3,500 out of about 900,000 ballots is roughly the norm. The race at the top of the ticket was the Presidential race, some people likely left the ballot blank for the Governor's race (the undervote) or filled the ballot in incorrectly (the spoiled ballot).

In Utah, for instance, 927,844 voted in the presidential race while 919,960 voted in the Governor's race.

Of course, the Republican Party knows this, but they are being there usual sleazy selves by trying to make it look like the waters are muddy when they, in fact, aren't.

Adam T | [Email](#) | Homepage | **12.31.04 - 9:36 pm** | <#>

Maria Cantwell will be comfortably reelected in 2006.

If Dino Rossi is the Republican nominee for the Senate in 2006 and he runs on a "vote for me, I was robbed" platform, the vote will be a landslide win for Cantwell.

Adam T | [Email](#) | Homepage | **12.31.04 - 9:39 pm** | <#>

But Dino Rossi and Christine Gregoire both deserve a fair check of the votes, and Sam Reed is trying to do that.

James Ervin | [Email](#) | [Homepage](#) | **12.31.04 - 9:39 pm** | <#>

Yes, I said "they have every right to look"

However

1.They are being sleazy in throwing this out knowing that there are logical explanations for the undervote, and trying to suggest this is something odd, when it is, in fact, perfectly normal.

2.I have every right to point out the hypocrisy and sleaziness of Mr. Rossi and the Republican Party.

Adam T | [Email](#) | [Homepage](#) | **12.31.04 - 9:42 pm** | <#>

You know Adam really does have a point. Dino Rossi should concede now. There is the instance that most people probably were more focused in the presidential race, not the governors race. And therefore more people most likely voted in that race and the under votes aren't going to show any clear win for Rossi. Rossi is the unelected governor of Washington State, not the elected one.

Larry in Nevada - On another blog yesterday you posted that Nevada doesn't have any "RINOS" equals Republicans in Name Only. Might it be that your Republican Governor, Kenny C Guinn, has comfortably raised taxes in the state and probably also vetoed the provision that conservatives wanted which was based on Yucca Mountain being used as a nuclear waste dump. Yes, I call that a RINO Governor. LOL.

Oh, and I am a Democrat. But I just had to make that clear that your Governor is a moderate, and in the words of Conservatives, "Rinos".

***on another note, I must also clarify that Gregoire the "pretender" would probably also mount to Rossi the Pretender. I don't think either of these governors are going to look like a true mandate to Washington State. I'm saying that as an independent minded Democrat. I believe in full reconciliation of the state of Washington, but Larry in Nevada is fully 100% right. Gregoire will be a pretender to the rest of the national 49 Governors and territorial governors and to Bush, Cheney and the mayor of Dc.

But Larry in Nevada is only half right. Dino Rossi will also be a pretender. I'm sure that Washington State wants a true election, and there should be an entire revote, not just a recall or a recount.

Maria L Watters | [Email](#) | [Homepage](#) | **12.31.04 - 9:45 pm** | <#>

I heard Montana under Judy Martz was nothing more than IL under George Ryan, or Alabama under Don Siegelman. Must have been pretty bad.

Thats what I figured. MT is the reddest of red states nationally. Like most of the West it is quite conservative.

So I guess they were just fed up with the corrupt GOP machine and elected CENTRIST Democrats.

No state that almost elected a Const. Party guy can be going Liberal.

Howard Dean is more of an idiot that I thought if he actually thinks this is a sign the heartland is going Blue

dudeman5685 | [Email](#) | [Homepage](#) | **12.31.04 - 9:47 pm** | <#>

Dudeman5685 -

I dare you to go post that whole comment you just wrote over on Howard Dean's site, Democracy for America, if your registered on his blogs.

Maria L Watters | [Email](#) | [Homepage](#) | **12.31.04 - 9:54 pm** | <#>

Actually i dont believe you have to be registered.

Maria L Watters | [Email](#) | [Homepage](#) | **12.31.04 - 9:56 pm** | <#>

dudeman, it was one constituency out of 100 where the Constitution Party candidate almost won.

Trying to draw a statewide conclusion from that is nothing short of ridiculous.

The rest of the state may be nothing at all like that one district.

Beyond that, the candidate was also a well known former long time Republican.

That said, I agree with some of the rest of the point. Montana seems to be somewhat of a libertarian state, given their massive vote in favor of legalizing marijuana for medicinal purposes, it is certainly not a liberal Democratic state.

Montana has been very competitive at the state level for a long time. It actually used to be

more competitive nationally. Bill Clinton won it in 1992, though he certainly benefited there from having Ross Perot on the ballot.

Adam T | [Email](#) | Homepage | **12.31.04 - 9:58 pm** | <#>

To me, although i may be a liberal/democratic, I actually profess Howard Dean's platform. but I dont really like that he took a firm position against the Iraq War and that is making him into a somehow liberal by the media polls, pollsters, and pundits. I really believe the Democrats should come to balance between liberal and centrist. I myself am fiscally conservative and believe in balanced budgets, but i also believe in economic stewardship to the disenfranchised and to the oppressed. I believe that we are one and all, and should help those less fortunate in society to be lifted up into prosperity, even people that cannot lift themselves up. But we must still do it within the means of a balanced budget, and therefore should restrict the guidelines center-left. that is why i, am proud to call myself, a progressive.

Maria L Watters | [Email](#) | Homepage | **12.31.04 - 9:59 pm** | <#>

Maria, there is no need for a revote in Washington State. True, the governor does not have much of a mandate. But,

1. There is no reason to believe the revote would change much of anything.
2. George W. Bush had no mandate after the 2000 election and it didn't prevent him from governing as though he had won in a landslide.

If Christine Gregoire feels she has no mandate, all she has to do is let the Democratic state legislature lead with legislation. She can then join on afterwards.

Adam T | [Email](#) | Homepage | **12.31.04 - 10:03 pm** | <#>

There was more to Brian Schweitzer's victory than just ideology. Remember, He was also a close call candidate for the Us Senate in 2000, so he already had statewide name recognition to make the race a close call race this year in 2004 against the Secretary of State Bob Brown.

And Republicans really were through with Judy Martz, as they saw her retire. They wanted someone with a fresh face, but unfortunately the state, leering for the same thing, wanted not only a fresh face, but a fresh party.

that is how Montana is now under full Democratic control now.

Maria L Watters | [Email](#) | Homepage | **12.31.04 - 10:04 pm** | <#>

Also

3. There is no reason for a revote. Christine Gregoire won a close victory, that, despite the lies coming from the Republicans, is valid.

If they can prove irregularities, that would be one thing. But, the fact that they are blowing hot air to try to confuse the public leads me to the conclusion that they damn well know there were no irregularities with the recount.

Adam T | [Email](#) | Homepage | **12.31.04 - 10:06 pm** | <#>

Well tell that to Larry the Librarian there Adam.....LOL.

Maria L Watters | [Email](#) | Homepage | **12.31.04 - 10:11 pm** | <#>

Adam T.

I live a few mile from Waco, Tx. I know this particualra mind set from which the old militia movement and now the Constution party is founded.The who state is infamous for having alot of "right wing extremist"

I could definely be said that a certain indepentend mindness an suspicion of the govt is prevalent there.

dudeman5685 | [Email](#) | Homepage | **12.31.04 - 10:11 pm** | <#>

From what I've read, Schweitzer is a very charismatic person with a strong electoral appeal.

The Republicans on this board are actually correct on this, trying to extrapolate Mr. Schweitzer's victory into a suggestion that Montana will become a tossup state at the presidential level, is foolish.

Mr. Schweitzer also shows something I've said before: running as an underdog in a race where you don't expect to win, but can use it to raise your profile, is a good idea. Mr. Schweitzer almost certainly would never have won the governorship had he not first run for the Senate.

Adam T | [Email](#) | Homepage | **12.31.04 - 10:11 pm** | <#>

The whole state.

No offense to MT and Idaho -- it is like the right wing equivalent of Northern California

dudeman5685 | [Email](#) | [Homepage](#) | **12.31.04 - 10:12 pm** | <#>

You know, It also did not prevent George W Bush from getting a second term either.

The truth is, everyone felt he had no mandate after 2000.

now they feel he has a huge mandate.

I guess that would make Christine Gregoire effective, as George W Bush and her are now compatible.

Maria L Watters | [Email](#) | [Homepage](#) | **12.31.04 - 10:12 pm** | <#>

dudeman, if you live in Texas then, you should certainly understand this:

Trying to extrapolate the vote for one Constitution Party candidate into a suggestion of how an entire state votes, is no different than going to Austin, Texas to find out how all the people in Texas view things.

I don't know how much of a following the Constitution Party has with the 'militia movement'. My understanding is that most of those people don't think there should be any government higher than the county level, so I don't think they would be supportive of any party that runs candidates for any statewide or national office.

As for Montana, I'm hardly an expert on the state, but I understand there used to be (and probably still is) a heavy east/west divide. One side is heavily Democratic, the other side is heavily Republican.

Adam T | [Email](#) | [Homepage](#) | **12.31.04 - 10:17 pm** | <#>

Maria--

I tried to post my comment and your two response on Democracy for America

They do force you to register, and I don't want to give out my e-mail to them.

I feel like that would give me a disease or something.

dudeman5685 | Email | Homepage | **12.31.04 - 10:17 pm** | <#>

Aloha 2005! Let's enjoy 2005 and let's all enjoy these next four years under a Republican President because there won't be another Republican sitting in the White House until 2037. 753 Days left until the Moron leaves the White House and a real President takes over with the Democrats for 28 years of Democratic Rule.

Happy New Year 2005 | Email | Homepage | **12.31.04 - 10:17 pm** | <#>

dudeman, if you live in Texas then, you should certainly understand this:

Trying to extrapolate the vote for one Constitution Party candidate into a suggestion of how an entire state votes, is no different than going to Austin, Texas to find out how all the people in Texas view things.

Austin is very exception its been the epicent of white progressivism since the 30s. It and the Vally are the only true blue areas in the state.

Montana has the Freemen, the Unibomber, and a long traditon of Perot-like populism, marijauna legaliztion efforts other stuff like that.

Its like how the Green Party elected a legislator. Other parts of the state are red -- The OC-- but there is certainly a leftish atmosphere in my state.

dudeman5685 | Email | Homepage | **12.31.04 - 10:22 pm** | <#>

In THE state.

California

dudeman5685 | Email | Homepage | **12.31.04 - 10:22 pm** | <#>

Oops. I meant 753 X 2 days left until the moron leaves the White House. I guess im a peculiar liberal that cannot count. LOL

Happy New Year 2005 | Email | Homepage | **12.31.04 - 10:23 pm** | <#>

753 X 2 = 1506
1506 - 25 = 1481

And 1481 Days left until the moron leaves the White House and i learn how to count.

LOL@Conservatives.

Happy New Year 2005 | Email | Homepage | **12.31.04 - 10:25 pm** | <#>

Happy--

You of all people should realize the vales of free market economics --

after all the Dems ran your state like for 40 ears by expanding state services to create jobs for Party activist and ran your state like a their own personal meal ticket.

They also taxed you so hard no large business could establish themselves there SO YOU WERE FORCED TO BE ON THERE WELFARE ROLE -- thus giving the party machine control over the state, the economy, and your live.

Aloha,
The Dem control of Hawaii

dudeman5685 | Email | Homepage | **12.31.04 - 10:27 pm** | <#>

those posts really do sound like that person is trying to make fun of conservatives and George W Bush for being the most lunatic president America has ever seen huh.

On any account, Maria Cantwell is my senator for 2006. Noone touches her, And no matter what Republicans say, She is not liberal.

My father is very conservative, and his views are almost identical to hers. But hers is more with a populist terms. His is more like with the tones of going in debt because he cannot furnish anything.

Maria L Watters | [Email](#) | Homepage | **12.31.04 - 10:29 pm** | <#>

How did you know i was from Hawaii?

Happy New Year 2005 | Email | Homepage | **12.31.04 - 10:31 pm** | <#>

I mean, How did you know i was from Hawaii?

mainmonkey | Email | Homepage | **12.31.04 - 10:32 pm** | <#>

My father is very conservative, and his views are almost identical to hers. But hers is

more with a populist terms. His is more like with the tones of going in debt because he cannot furnish anything

Thats were I think the Dean movement is gaining stength -- reaching out to conservatives not being as condesending as folks like Al Franken.

He is making his pitch to the Heartland.

dudeman5685 | [Email](#) | [Homepage](#) | **12.31.04 - 10:32 pm** | <#>

Mainmonky,

You said Aloha in your 1st post.

I see Dean tring to attach him self to Heartland Values in his Georgetown speech.

Maybe if he speaks out against violence and sex on TV he can when with some "Moral Values" voters.

dudeman5685 | [Email](#) | [Homepage](#) | **12.31.04 - 10:34 pm** | <#>

Ahhhhh! so when do you give me the back rub, dudeman?

mainmonkey | [Email](#) | [Homepage](#) | **12.31.04 - 10:36 pm** | <#>

No.

The Media and the whole "moral values" spin was Karl Rove muckmania.

If indeed someone wants to base on moral values so much, Why not try having a political party that cares for the needs of the less fortuneate (aka the poor vs the rich), lifts the oppressed (aka gays, coloreds, disableds, women, etc) , and why not having a political party that puts the interests of our children, our soldiers, and our families first. First above the interests of the wealthiest people in America.

I call that moral values. So dont give me that moral values Karl Rove MuckRake spin.

Maria L Watters | [Email](#) | [Homepage](#) | **12.31.04 - 10:41 pm** | <#>

Maria--

Capitalism does those things. The Free Market does those things.

I have been in a welfare program before -- and you know what?

Once you accept Welfare under the old system, you give the govt free reign to run your life.

Making some one depented on the govt for sustenance does not help them. It only enslaves them.

I know.

dudeman5685 | Email | Homepage | **12.31.04 - 10:48 pm** | <#>

I know what your going to say now Dudeman.

Your going to say. "Yes the GOP does all of that."

Well lets take a look at that checklist of Republicans in Congress.

1. voted to slash veterans benefits while praising our troops in combat.
2. voted to increase education initiatives (NCLB) , yet leaves every child left behind by not funding it properly (Ask the American Federation of Teachers and National Education Associatoin.)
3. Will not back Affirmative Action and has been against Civil Rights since the 1960s c/o the dixiecrats like Thurmond who moved from the Dems ot the Reps when they embraced civil rights from Truman to LBJ. Wants to ban abortion and not provide women their most reproductive needs (including needs to prevent unwanted pregnancies), without clear explicification from the Bible and wants to shove the Bible and Religion up someone's asses. Wants to add a FEDERAL MARRIAGE AMENDMENT that will discriminate nationally against a gay's fundamental right to engage in a personal trust with someone they love, just like straights. Is against the Americans with Disablities Act and wants it overturned.
Yes, there is your compassion towards gays, straights , women, and disabled people GOP-Style.
4. And wants to slash programs like Welfare and Social Security that help the poor and the elderly. FDR said it was a fundamental right that if a person worked hard all of their life, The Government will not abandon you in your golden age (and thus he wanted the Seniors to receive this assistance for working hard all oftheir life.)

I guess that is compassion right from the GOP Tent. GOP Style.

Im glad im a progressive and liberal, and im proud to be. Thanks to the Gop, Noone

except the privileged wealthy few will ever get their voice heard in Society, no matter how hard they work no matter how they look and act no matter how young or old.

And one more thing, I guess we like to praise combat but slash veterans benefits. The GOP Style is: "lets take away these mens' pay while they are trying to preserve democracy worldwide."

Maria L Watters | [Email](#) | [Homepage](#) | **12.31.04 - 10:51 pm** | <#>

And BTW,

I know in your world of Gods and Monsters, Karl Rove is this evil sorcerer who can creates stroms of public opinion out of his ass.

But c'mon!

The Moral thing came from the Liberal Courts that wanted "Under God" out of the Pledge, the 10 Commandments out of the Court, Maddana & Britney and Janet Jacksons RIGHT breast.

The Lberals also brought up Gay Mariege, and we reacted the way the everyone expected.

dudeman5685 | [Email](#) | [Homepage](#) | **12.31.04 - 10:52 pm** | <#>

Ah, Maria you anticipated me exactly

1. Social Security: It is a well documented fact that Markets deliver better goods than Govt edict.

If you want the Federal govt to control SS, you ipso facto are sying that seniors are too stupid to choose and handle their futures by them selves.

dudeman5685 | [Email](#) | [Homepage](#) | **12.31.04 - 10:57 pm** | <#>

What Liberal Courts?

There has been a Republican President since 1969 in every year except Carter and Clinton.

There is no Liberal Courts anymore.

They are full of right wing retreads.

Your full of the shit if you think there are liberal courts in this country.

And the Massachusetts Supreme Court alright? There has been a Republican Governor in Ma since 1991.

Maria L Watters | [Email](#) | Homepage | **12.31.04 - 10:59 pm** | <#>

2. Wants to add a FEDERAL MARRIAGE AMENDMENT that will discriminate nationally against a gay's fundamental right to engage in a personal trust with someone they love, just like straights.

Actually GOP renegates shot down the FMA, which I don't support. It is a state govenment problem.

Still, how is mariege a fundamental right?

dudeman5685 | [Email](#) | Homepage | **12.31.04 - 11:00 pm** | <#>

Why is it that Conservatives can only blame "The Courts."?

Try blaming themselves.

When i was in high school, I went to a public school. Out of the whole school, I met 1 gay student. 1. Imagine that. Now im not really one to brag, but i wasnt really a popular student so that might be why. But guess what? There was only 1 gay student.

Yet, here is what i saw when i looked across town at the 1 catholic school (private religious school that is the kind that are vouchers to conservatives) and i found about 5 gay students in a school of about 100 students registered because i went to a small town city area.

Now, Isnt it that Conservatives are really breeding what they hate most? By neglecting to help the helpless in school, and leaving them to fend for themselves. There were all kinds of extracurricular activities in my school (tennis baseball basketball football etc) and the only extra curricular activity in this school was , let me barf, BIBLE STUDY.

Hmmm.

I think that the idea of private schools might just be breeding the self mongered hate religions that we have today from Jerry Falwell, Pat Robertson, and James Dobson.

Maria L Watters | [Email](#) | Homepage | **12.31.04 - 11:04 pm** | <#>

What can you say about a problem like Mar-i-a!

Sorry, couldn't resist.

Lets take the Fed courts that took the 10 commandments out of the State SC building.
Some right wing nuts, eh?

Or the one that tried to take "under God" out of the pledge.

Or stop the CA recall

And just because, they were appointed by Reps, doesn't mean they are cons.

After all Earl Warren was a Rep.

The courts in this county seemed to be saying:

YOU STUPID HICKS CANT HAVE GOD IN PUBLIC ANYMORE.

ENJOY YOUR GAY MARIEGE!

dudeman5685 | [Email](#) | [Homepage](#) | **12.31.04 - 11:04 pm** | <#>

I think that the idea of private schools might just be breeding the self mongered hate religions that we have today from Jerry Falwell, Pat Robertson, and James Dobson.

I think you just alienated half the counrty.

Are you just out of High school?
I'm 19.

dudeman5685 | [Email](#) | [Homepage](#) | **12.31.04 - 11:05 pm** | <#>

Also, My school was a school of about 500 or so.

And one more note, There were plenty of sports and plenty of clubs also like many you will ever see at a public school.

Maria L Watters | [Email](#) | [Homepage](#) | **12.31.04 - 11:06 pm** | <#>

Alienated half the country. I probably only alienated half of the school there. Or probably just 1% of the country.

I'm telling you you cant get any more than Religious Schools being full of hatred and intolerance.

And by the way, I graduated in 1989. I'm 34 as of last Saturday and yes, My birthday is on Christmas Day. But my father and mother rubbed religion into my life and my two sisters' lives so much we dont have much of a disdain for religion. However, we still consider ourselves Catholics, or Episcopalians.

Maria L Watters | [Email](#) | [Homepage](#) | **12.31.04 - 11:09 pm** | <#>

all vouchers is is letting POOR PEOPLE decide what to do with their own money.

You pay a tax to the Dchool District?

If you are not satisfied with the result, shouldn't you be able to fire you school district-- take YOUR Money-- and go to another school.

btw, I find it interesting that you used as an example a catholic school and then berated evangelical leaders.

We don't care if you go to a religious school or not!

It should be your choice what to do with your child education, as it SHOULD BE YOUR CHOICE HOW TO SAVE FOR YOUR REIRE MENT.

It is the Left that insist on uniformity! "One America"

dudeman5685 | [Email](#) | [Homepage](#) | **12.31.04 - 11:09 pm** | <#>

I'm telling you you cant get any more than Religious Schools being full of hatred and intolerance.

Free Speech.

Yeah, at the Evangelic church I used to got to I heard a lot of polemic RE: Catholic docterine, Mormon doctrine, homosexuality.

You could call it bashing. And they had a school.

But polemicing isn't hating. But it does encourage a very ideological, very conformist attitude.

But that is true of all organized religons, and under vouchers you could send you kids to a

school that has to accept civil rights guideline if they take state money.

I left Evangelism btw.

dudeman5685 | [Email](#) | [Homepage](#) | **12.31.04 - 11:14 pm** | <#>

I think that the idea of private schools might just be breeding the self mongered hate religions that we have today from Jerry Falwell, Pat Robertson, and James Dobson.

You seem to be a "intolerant" against religion your self.

But the heartland is religous, and we like it that way, we don't want some one coming in here telling us how stupid we are to live our lives the way we do and that if we only ACT, and THINK, and BE like them, we'd be ok

How would you feel if some one came to your door an insinuated that?

dudeman5685 | [Email](#) | [Homepage](#) | **12.31.04 - 11:17 pm** | <#>

But that is where the left comes in?

What about people that CANNOT DO THAT ON THEIR OWN?

That is where Liberals are right and Conservatives are Wrong.

You have to help those in need.

If you dont than you violated the most sacred testament of the most sacred book of all time - The Bible The New Testament.

Jesus did not preach that some rich private institution that wouldnt care for the poor would care for the poor. He preached that it is within our hearts to do our best, and it is within a public facility that would be a much better "uniformity."

When you walk to a rich person, like my dad no offense to him i still love him for the world, but he is stuckup, self-centered, and conceited. He is not generous at all. He doesnt even believe in giving to anyone less fortuneate. He says that the Government should not give handouts, only handups. That they should give handups not handouts.

Maria L Watters | [Email](#) | [Homepage](#) | **12.31.04 - 11:18 pm** | <#>

Sorry.

I'm not going to get into a total religious discussion here, but the government is not going to do that.

I am a liberal who believes that the States should have the power to regulate their own form of Civil Unions and/or Gay Marriage, at the behest at the majority of voters of their state in what we call referendums.

I don't believe in trying to rub something in nationally , whether it be an amendment against gay marriage or an amendment for gay marriage.

When i was down in Alabama on a vacation just a couple of months ago, in Mobile, I was spurred at the thought of a couple of Mormon Republicans, who said they were on a Missionary tour from Utah, displaying what i considered total nudity back in IL. They completely in the front yard of their house, was like dancing to the music playing in their own house, but in their front yard where everyone can see it. It took four hours for the police that drove by every half hour to finally drive by and tell them to stop or they will be arrested. Is that the type of behavior Evangelicals should express, in Alabama?

Maria L Watters | [Email](#) | [Homepage](#) | **12.31.04 - 11:26 pm** | <#>

When you walk to a rich person, like my dad no offense to him i still love him for the world, but he is stuckup, self-centered, and conceited. He is not generous at all. He doesnt even believe in giving to anyone less fortunate. He says that the Government should not give handouts, only handups. That they should give handups not handouts.

I come from a poor back ground.

All the govt. ever gave me was grief.

We finally got our dream to come true because of a private institution, the Fannie May foundation.

Maybe you should stop pontificating about what should happen to the poor, and go down and ask us about our experiences, our needs, and our values.

One side is for the rich not to care.

Another is try to run our lives.

Central to George W. Bush's philosophy, and remember, I live in the capital of TX, is that he tries to help private (read: DIGNIFIED) institutions and the govt to come together to help the poor in ways that don't just create sadist leeches in the form of welfare bureaucrats

(sorry, not all of them were like, many were nice, but the system sucked)

dudeman5685 | [Email](#) | [Homepage](#) | **12.31.04 - 11:27 pm** | <#>

By the way we knew they were Mormon Republican Missionaries from Utah because they came to my friend's house the day before. It was a friend from school who graduated with me btw, and i was visiting her for the first time at our 15 year high school reunion, then decided to go vacation where she lived in Mobile, Alabama.

But they had the day before came to our house preaching that it was wrong to do those type of acts in our living room, then we saw what we saw the next day because they were staying down the street about a block.

Maria L Watters | [Email](#) | [Homepage](#) | **12.31.04 - 11:29 pm** | <#>

And for the sickohs on here, it was a man and a woman, not two men or two women that were the Missionaries.

Maria L Watters | [Email](#) | [Homepage](#) | **12.31.04 - 11:30 pm** | <#>

When i was down in Alabama on a vacation just a couple of months ago, in Mobile, I was spurred at the thought of a couple of Mormon Republicans, who said they were on a Missionary tour from Utah, displaying what i considered total nudity back in IL. They completely in the front yard of their house, was like dancing to the music playing in their own house, but in their front yard where everyone can see it. It took four hours for the police that drove by every half hour to finally drive by and tell them to stop or they will be arrested. Is that the type of behavior Evangelicals should express, in Alabama

Evangelical are different from Mormons.but that proably wasn't LDS, but one of the more exotic off-brand Mormons.

What about those guys who run around nude at Gay Pride Parades?

Some people are just wackos

dudeman5685 | [Email](#) | [Homepage](#) | **12.31.04 - 11:30 pm** | <#>

Maria L Watters -

Evangelicals are not Mormons. They are Christians, Jews, and Muslims of Extreme Right Religions that are enhanced not by profession, but by choice. If you really want to give a Mormon the choice between the Bible and their so-called Book Of Mormon, They will not select the Bible at 85% of their meetings. Mormons are resolute when it comes to the

bible, and they only desire it for selected "occassions."

Jason Vendel | [Email](#) | [Homepage](#) | **12.31.04 - 11:35 pm** | <#>

You know the plot to much of BATTLESTAR GALACTICA was based off the Book of Mormon.

Other then that, I know nothing about their religion.

dudeman5685 | [Email](#) | [Homepage](#) | **12.31.04 - 11:37 pm** | <#>

Maria L Watters

Just tell me one thing --do you love America.

Are you a Patriot.

That is a secular religon in the hearland.

Are you a liberal because you love America?

Or do you think overt displays of patriotism are backward, like most overt displays of religion.

dudeman5685 | [Email](#) | [Homepage](#) | **12.31.04 - 11:39 pm** | <#>

Dudeman5685 -

You just insulted a member of my family that i hold dear. I don't think that i could ever repay your friendship. Your a traitor.

Maria L Watters | [Email](#) | [Homepage](#) | **12.31.04 - 11:40 pm** | <#>

If i were to forgive you for insulting ME, and my partner, Lisa, along with our other partners, Dirk and Kirk. I would have to break up my relationship with all of them, and not you.

I don't believe you could say that about "gay pride" celebrations.

Maria L Watters | [Email](#) | [Homepage](#) | **12.31.04 - 11:42 pm** | <#>

What are you talking about.

all you've done tonight is spew hate and intolerance on religion all night!

If some one danced naked in public -- he or she is a wacko

dudeman5685 | [Email](#) | [Homepage](#) | **12.31.04 - 11:43 pm** | <#>

And to answer your question, Of course I love America. I especially want to reach a hand to the ones that need a hand.

Maria L Watters | [Email](#) | [Homepage](#) | **12.31.04 - 11:44 pm** | <#>

I have nothing against gay pride marches.

You see people run around nude at demonstrations, concerts etc.

Any one who is purposefully nude in public has some thing wrong with him.

I'm sorry, I didn't mean to insult you but you should have paid better to what I was saying.

dudeman5685 | [Email](#) | [Homepage](#) | **12.31.04 - 11:46 pm** | <#>

But thats the thing.

LOL

I dont hate religion, for i am part of religion. I just hate religious philosophers and televangies that want God put over a Bible and then spread all across America, even in front of Atheists and other Agnostics that may not believe in the same things, but shouldnt be condemned for that.

But i dont hate religion, I just hate the concept of religion as to how it is being spewed by televangies and evangelicals that want to rub their bulls**t in their face.

Maria L Watters | [Email](#) | [Homepage](#) | **12.31.04 - 11:47 pm** | <#>

i mean rub their bull in their face*

I meant to say i do not like them rubbing their bull from their faces in other peoples faces.

Maria L Watters | [Email](#) | [Homepage](#) | **12.31.04 - 11:48 pm** | <#>

I don't believe you could say that about "gay pride" celebrations.

?????????

So if I say that I don't think homosexuality is an acceptable life style, I hate them.

That is the problem with libs. can't say that, can't say this YOU HAVE TO THINK A CERTAIN WAY.

I respect your right to be gay. I didn't even know you were a lesbian.

But you have to respect my rights to disagree with you about the morality of homosexuality.

dudeman5685 | [Email](#) | [Homepage](#) | **12.31.04 - 11:49 pm** | <#>

t God put over a Bible and then spread all across America, even in front of Atheists and other Agnostics that may not believe in the same things, but shouldnt be condemned for that.

You mean like you rub gayness in our faces at Gay Pride marches?

The beauty of America is we argee to disagree.

Alot of gay activist don't seem to see it that way.

They want to FORCE us to accept the validity of gayness.

dudeman5685 | [Email](#) | [Homepage](#) | **12.31.04 - 11:52 pm** | <#>

That is what gay mariege is, forcing the state and everyone in it to recognize what you do is right.

I will stay out of you yard if you will just stay out of mine.

dudeman5685 | [Email](#) | [Homepage](#) | **12.31.04 - 11:53 pm** | <#>

First of all, I respect your rights to disagree with me. But dont rub it in.

And I am respectful of your rights.

and Second of all, Im not really a lesbian. I am Bi-Sexual.

I have a female partner and a male partner in which i intend to marry the male partner but still be with the female partner in a wedding on Feb 14 2006.

Maria L Watters | [Email](#) | Homepage | **12.31.04 - 11:54 pm** | <#>

Why do you think i said Lisa, and Dirk and Kirk.

Dirk and Kirk are gay.

Lisa and i are lesbians.

But to preserve the integrity of marriage and to preserve our lifestyles as well, I am marrying Dirk and she is marrying Kirk in a double wedding ceremony that is being prepared as we speak before then to marry in a straight wedding.

But my sexual preference is not lesbian. It is Bi-Sexual as i like both boys and girls.

Maria L Watters | [Email](#) | Homepage | **12.31.04 - 11:56 pm** | <#>

But wait, I thought you and i have talked on here before.

I thought we discussed all of that not that you would remember.

Sorry Dudeman. If you could ever forgive me, I forgive you.

Maria L Watters | [Email](#) | Homepage | **12.31.04 - 11:56 pm** | <#>

But it is basica human nature to rub it it.

Your people trying to tellus how ignorant and backword us rural poor Conservative Christians are.

Us telling you how immoral (some of us beleive) your activities are.

But it isn't my desicion what you do.

dudeman5685 | [Email](#) | Homepage | **12.31.04 - 11:58 pm** | <#>

I forgive you.

If you will forgive me.

Wow, a four erson wedding.

I'd hate to be the the one to plan that!

Actually it would pay a good deal!

dudeman5685 | [Email](#) | [Homepage](#) | **01.01.05 - 12:00 am** | <#>

But By the way, What do you mean FORCE GAY LIFESTYLES UPON A STATE?

What about a straight lifestyle being forced upon gays?

I guess Conservatives like you just cannot handle reversing course, you just care for your own disingenuity.

Putting a Constitutional Amendment to Ban Gay Marriage is exactly that.

Maria L Watters | [Email](#) | [Homepage](#) | **01.01.05 - 12:01 am** | <#>

Actually, It is being planned by both Lisa and I's fathers'. Since it is a double wedding with two brides, We are the two brides, Our fathers will give us both away, to the men and will pay the wedding out together as our families are now working together me and hers.

Maria L Watters | [Email](#) | [Homepage](#) | **01.01.05 - 12:09 am** | <#>

I don't care about your life style (they just droped the ball in NYC and Colin Powell is singing)

dudeman5685 | [Email](#) | [Homepage](#) | **01.01.05 - 12:12 am** | <#>

Actually i was kidding about the gay pride celebrations, Dudeman. I dont really go to any of them. I dont like to rub my personal life and beliefs into peoples lives, so i stop here and now about this online here at this blog. But i must admit, I will forgive you as i am a woman of heart. Anyways, I have to go for now. Dont expect any more of this useless chatter from me here anymore any further. Its back to good old politics for now on.

Take care and goodnight all.

Happy New Year Dudeman and everyone!

Goodnight.

Maria L Watters | [Email](#) | Homepage | **01.01.05 - 12:14 am** | <#>

dammit, it would have been so cool if I posted that right as he was singing, damn. I forgot to click.

Anyway, I think what Laura Bush just said was right-2005 is a year of hope.

Do you know what all aquaitences be forgot means?

When it was writtien "aquaitences" meant disputes, bad feelings, the old quarrels.

Let auld aquatence be forgot and...

dudeman5685 | Email | Homepage | **01.01.05 - 12:15 am** | <#>

Yes, Thats why i have to go.

Goodnight.

Maria L Watters | [Email](#) | Homepage | **01.01.05 - 12:15 am** | <#>

Go to fox, listen to the bumper sticker song!

dudeman5685 | Email | Homepage | **01.01.05 - 12:18 am** | <#>

Well Laura Bush is the play-doh first lady, But i hope shes right. We gotta put the past to rest and move on with new hopes for America.

Maria L Watters | [Email](#) | Homepage | **01.01.05 - 12:20 am** | <#>

I can't help but cry when ever I hear "Bumper of My SUV"

It's always the part when she sings "My father was in 'Nam and my gradpa won his purple haert at on the shores of Normandy"

I had ancestors at Normandy. Did you?

If you did, they served under the same flag didn't they.

That same flag with its RED strips, and the BLUE FIELD, didn't they?

dudeman5685 | Email | Homepage | **01.01.05 - 12:24 am** | <#>

I hope George W. address some of that in his inaugural. I hope he paraphrases Jeffersons 1801 inaugural, he is the person that both liberal and conservatives trace their lineage.

But every difference of opinion is not a difference of principle. We have called by different names brethren of the same principle. We are all Republicans, we are all Federalists.

Today, we are all Conservatives, we are all Liberals.

Or we should be.

dudeman5685 | Email | Homepage | **01.01.05 - 12:31 am** | <#>

dudeman, who are you talking to?

Allison | Email | Homepage | **01.01.05 - 12:38 am** | <#>

Is it possible for a 15 year old girl to marry a 26 year old male in the state of Florida?
<http://www.faqfarm.com/Love/Under.../Underage/ 43689>

See this link.

Ak | Email | Homepage | **01.01.05 - 12:40 am** | <#>

Damnit. My keys fell in the wrong place when i was trying to retype my name. The Ak was me sorry.

Maria L Watters | [Email](#) | Homepage | **01.01.05 - 12:41 am** | <#>

Anyways, I have to go for now.

Goodnight everyone.

And Happy New Year.

Maria L Watters | [Email](#) | [Homepage](#) | **01.01.05 - 12:44 am** | <#>

Maria, I sorry I can't tell you about that law in florida, but this is the test of "the bumper sticker song" I think you will understand why I cried and got all ecumenical at about 11:00, out time:

I've got a bright red sticker on the back of my car
Says United States Marines
And yesterday a lady in a mini-van held up a middle finger at me
Does she think she knows what I stand for
Or the things that I believe
Just by looking at a sticker for the US Marines
On The Bumper Of My SUV

See, my brother Chris, he's been in for more than 14 years now
Our dad was in the Navy during Vietnam
Did his duty then he got out
And my grandpa earned his purple heart
On the beach of Normandy
That's why I've got a sticker for the US Marines
On The Bumper Of SUV

But that doesn't mean that I want war
I'm not Republican or Democrat
But I've gone all around this crazy world
Just to try and better understand

Yes I do have questions
I get to ask them because I'm free
That's why I've got a sticker for the US Marines
On the Bumper Of My SUV

Cause I've been to Hiroshima
And I've been to the DMZ
I've walked on the sand in Baghdad
Still don't have all of the answers I need
But I guess I wanna know where she's been
Before she judges and gestures to me
Cause she don't like my sticker
For the US Marines
On the bumper of my SUV

So I hope that lady in her mini-van

Turns on her radio and hears this from me
As she picks up her kids from their private school
And drives home safely on our city streets
Or to the building where her church group meets

Yeah, that's why I've got a sticker for the US Marines
On the bumper of my SUV

dudeman5685 | Email | Homepage | **01.01.05 - 12:46 am** | <#>

Abraham Lincoln, while against the "Institution of Slavery," would have preferred to change that institution gradually and not at all if it would destroy the "Institution of the Union of States"

He was a true Political Conservative.

Conservatives understand the need for change, but prefer not to overhaul the Constitutional system, or modify it to such a degree that it does not reflect the intentions of our Founding Fathers.

While I agree that our Founding Fathers did not take into consideration such, then nonexistent, inventions as automobiles, sky-scrappers, atomic weapons, noise pollution, air pollution and such, the Bill of Rights and 10 Commandments are still excellent guiding principles for living.

Political Conservatism has as its foundation strong protective beliefs in the US Constitution (especially the Bill of Rights) and Judeo-Christian 10 Commandments.

As per God's 10 Commandments, religion has always played a part in the development of this great Republic. The Decalogue (10 Commandments) are equally valid for any religion even though it has its foundation in Judeo-Christian practices. The question arises naturally from this postulate as such, "Does one, necessarily, need to believe in God to be a Political Conservative as it is described above? The answer, of course, is YES.

Atheists cannot be Political Conservatives by this definition. It stands to reason that, if one is to subscribe to the 10 Commandments of God, one needs to subscribe to the principle that God exists. However, since the 10 Commandments have such universal application, it is possible that an Atheist or Agnostic could hold the Decalog as a set of guiding practical principles for living while, at the same time, denying the authorship of God. Contradictions provide challenges to thinking beings and, as such, offer spice to epistemological activity.

Rep Fascist Roy | Email | Homepage | **01.01.05 - 12:47 am** | <#>

Political Conservatism is basically a positive positioning in terms of adhering to philosophical and societal traditions and institutions.

To say that being a Conservative is to be against something is to miss the point of Conservative principles. In the following premises, I will attempt to clarify my understanding of Political Conservatism

Maria L Watters | [Email](#) | [Homepage](#) | **01.01.05 - 12:49 am** | <#>

Abraham Lincoln, while against the "Institution of Slavery," would have preferred to change that institution gradually and not at all if it would destroy the "Institution of the Union of States"

Thats what they did in the UK and its territories.

Queen Victoria freed the British slaves in 1837.

dudeman5685 | [Email](#) | [Homepage](#) | **01.01.05 - 12:52 am** | <#>

3. Joe Farah's Opinion

"Joe Farah points out in his Between the Lines (12/18/98) that "As president, Bill Clinton has...squandered \$5.5 billion in U.S. taxpayer dollars on containing the Iraqi threat..." (Bush has spent much more than \$5.5 billion)

<http://www.conservativeusa.org/w....org/wagdog.htm>

4. Reasons not to invade Iraq (written by Conservatives)

It is unconstitutional for America to go to war without a Congressional declaration of war.

Given the present set of facts, there is no Constitutional predicate on the basis of which Congress has the authority to initiate war, even with a declaration of war.

In war, there is no substitute for victory. Victory, as commonly understood, with respect to an assault on Iraq, has not been defined, let alone declared to be the objective of any such attack.

The strategic position of the United States in the world may be diminished, rather than enhanced, by an attack on Iraq. Many regimes friendly to the United States will be placed at severe risk if they are seen to assist, or even favor, the U.S. attack.

If we "succeed", what have we gained? If we don't begin a war, what have we lost?

War has consequences which are often unintended and almost always beyond comprehensive anticipation. If we and our "allies" join to attack Iraq, Iraq and its allies

may combine to attack us in ways which cannot be fully foreseen. How many planes will crash? How many water supplies will be polluted? How many nuclear weapons will be detonated? How many civilian targets will be made subject to terrorist assault? Will chemical weapons be deployed?

<http://www.conservativeusa.org/i...rg/iraq-war.htm>

Daemon In Delaware | [Email](#) | [Homepage](#) | **01.01.05 - 12:57 am** | <#>

Those where the Old Conservatives Daemon, Bush is a Neo-conservative.

dudeman5685 | [Email](#) | [Homepage](#) | **01.01.05 - 12:59 am** | <#>

The Voice of the Freepers

"Last time it was Iraq, Now we are bombing Afghanistan and Sudan"

"Afgahnistan ought to be our ally"

"Low-risk targets with very little chance of retaliation or casualties for US personnel-how coincidental"

"WE DON'T HAVE ENOUGH TROOPS TO STAY ALERT EVERYWHERE"

"This brash act by a brash child-man is a direct threat to the security of every citizen inside our own borders for the people against whom he acted are non-forgiving and have no fear of death"

"PLEASE GOD HELP US!!!! I AM THE STUPID1 ----- please excuse me for yelling, but now I'm really scared of the lenghts this man is willing to go"

All from

<http://www.freerepublic.com/foru...rum/a530320.htm>

Daemon In Delaware | [Email](#) | [Homepage](#) | **01.01.05 - 12:59 am** | <#>

Daemon--

The party/ideology in opposition is against whatever the one in pwoer does.

Would you be FOR the war if we had a Dem Pres?

Seriously.

To be honest w/ myself I not sure I would be as gung ho about Iraq if a Dem started it.

dudeman5685 | [Email](#) | [Homepage](#) | **01.01.05 - 1:01 am** | <#>

FEAST YOUR EYES ON JUST ONE MORE:

Osama is not worth it, cries the Conservatives

"Osama bin Laden's camp in Afghanistan consisted of shacks and tents, hardly a fit target for a missile that costs nearly a million dollars per copy"

<http://www.aim.org/publications/...tor/1999/04/0...>

Daemon In Delaware | [Email](#) | [Homepage](#) | **01.01.05 - 1:02 am** | <#>

Bush gave the Dems, basically all they wanted, the difference were minor, but they opposed it because it was HIS.

dudeman5685 | [Email](#) | [Homepage](#) | **01.01.05 - 1:02 am** | <#>

<http://www.aim.org/publications/.../1999/04/02.htm>

sorry. That last one should be linked here.

Daemon In Delaware | [Email](#) | [Homepage](#) | **01.01.05 - 1:03 am** | <#>

Daemon -

Conservatives should not be blamed for wanting war. Liberals should be blamed for not wanting war and thinking this world is a perfect place. That is what they do every day. All Day. All Night. They bicker that this and that cannot be changed. They bicker so much as to think that you would have them put socks in their mouth and shut them up for god sake. Why would you think that Bush and the "Neo-Conservatives" as you called it in your endless rants there i just read would believe that it is Conservatives that want war. Clinton did nothing to avoid this, as he didnt do a damn thing about Saddam nor Bin laden and part of the reason that we are in where we are in right now as this war, is because of him.

Clinton did nothing to deter the emotional , psychological and physical effects of all of this. If he hadnt portrayed such a sensitive approach to his so-called peace in the middle east initiatives, We would not be in the mess of trying to hunt down Bin Laden, and trying to preserve peace in Israel between the Israelis and the Palestinians, and we would most certainly not be dealing "sensitively" with Saddam Hussein.

Lawrence G Henderson | [Email](#) | [Homepage](#) | **01.01.05 - 1:17 am** | <#>

I agree, Lawrence, Clinton only cared about the dangers Bin Laden and Saddam posed when he was in trouble.

We started bombing Iraq the day his hearing started and ended the day he was impeached. That should tell you something.

The Arabs saw what they were doing, and it REALLY increased the anti-Americanism in that part of the world.

dudeman5685 | [Email](#) | [Homepage](#) | **01.01.05 - 1:20 am** | <#>

Daemon -

And one more thing about the sensitivity, It is Clinton's fault that what happened over the last 4 years happened between the Israelis and the Palestinians, As he is the one that tried to bring a terrorist (Yasir Arafat) to trying to negotiate "peace settlements" with all of the succeeding Israeli and Palestinian leaders of the two authorities over in Israel. You do not try to bring the two sides to a table, especially when one side is a terrorist.

Lawrence G Henderson | [Email](#) | [Homepage](#) | **01.01.05 - 1:22 am** | <#>

Thanks alot, Judy Martz!

You have now officially turned Montana into another liberal safehaven bastion for Democrats to gloat about.

Why dont you go marry your friend, George Ryan and live happily ever after on some ranch in Montana or some prison cell in IL?

Jason Vendel | [Email](#) | [Homepage](#) | **01.01.05 - 1:36 am** | <#>

Dudeman -

In contrast to what you were telling Maria above, Are you saying that this whole gay marriage tripoli that the Republicans were playing the game of dividing us on was all a big joke and there really isnt going to be a gay marriage ban in the Us Constitution?

Way to go bud.

Liberals are the ones that have fired back now though. They t hought this was all a big rambunctious reality campaign, yet they got fooled. This was all a big display of feeling because George W Bush and Dick Cheney are both opposed to such a ban in the

Constitution. See, heres the lesson. We had to teach Liberals that indeed there comes a time when you have to be honest and trustworthy with your feelings. They were not honest and trustworthy with their feelings this year, as they felt that they were only united behind Kerry-Edwards 2004 because they hated Bush and Cheney in 2004. Campaigns should not be based on hatred and intolerance, for it should be based on a message. You have to have a real message and you have to have a candidate and candidate(s) with a positive outlook on life. You cannot just simply unite behind someone because you want to get rid of their opponents. The reason why Republicans did this to turnout our base was to teach a moral values lesson to Liberals about the Constitution, and about moral values posthumously itself. It was to teach Liberals that uniting behind a man just simply because you hated his opponent is wrong.

That isnt what campaigns are about.

Now, as 2005 rings in, Let's swear in President Bush and Vice President Cheney. Just for any sake, a Democrat will win the White House in 2008, but 2004 Republicans were just teaching a lesson to liberals, and to democrats, about hate and intolerance.

Wilma | [Email](#) | [Homepage](#) | **01.01.05 - 1:48 am** | <#>

Wilma, Liberals are the big fools.

Lawrence G Henderson | [Email](#) | [Homepage](#) | **01.01.05 - 1:57 am** | <#>

Don Siegelman was one of the best Governor's Alabama ever had. Fob James was awful. Riley has showed some political courage, yet the right wing have his hands tied and won't let him do what needs to be done to move Alabama forward.

Anonymous | [Email](#) | [Homepage](#) | **01.01.05 - 3:35 am** | <#>

I get sick of hearing people in BOTH parties justifying recounts in their party and opposing them for the opposite party. BOTH parties are guilty as hell. I say ban absentee ballots. If you aren't able to vote, too bad. Or count the votes first. I am sick of delayed elections, changed recounts and the rest. This IS NOT a party issue. BOTH parties need to get their act together and put an end to these kangaroo elections. Either you get your fat ass to the polls on Election Day and vote touch screen or you just don't vote.

Anonymous | [Email](#) | [Homepage](#) | **01.01.05 - 8:51 am** | <#>

It is NOT a Republican or Democrat thing. It is a messed up electoral system in some states. I live in Kentucky and we don't have such foolishness. Even in the 1998 Senate race it was over by morning. No recounts. No punched ballots. No new ballots discovered

a few days later and people say we have a problem with vote buying. Gimme a break!

Anonymous | [Email](#) | [Homepage](#) | **01.01.05 - 8:53 am** | <#>

SCREW Rossi and Gregoire. Neither one cares about the electoral system and only about their own political career! In LA, Buddy Tauzin lost by 600 votes and he didn't put the people of Louisiana through a recall mess.

Washington has gone through this mess before. The west coast states are so concerned about everyone having the right to vote and yet the numbers flip back and forth.

We need to look about party labels and see a system that reeks to the high heavens.

Anonymous | [Email](#) | [Homepage](#) | **01.01.05 - 8:56 am** | <#>

The people in Washington need to DEMAND a better electoral system! Iraq will probably do a better job getting the results certified! 2000 Senate race was the same mess.

What a mess. One helluva mess. I couldn't respect either candidate because ballots are found or maybe manufactured. Again, I say BAN absentee ballots. We need the results certified ASAP!! And it is NOT a REPUBLICAN or DEMOCRAT thing like some partisan pigs on both sides of the aisle wants to make it seem.

Anonymous | [Email](#) | [Homepage](#) | **01.01.05 - 9:00 am** | <#>

Washington's electoral system sucks. About as sorry as Ukraine's electoral system.

Anonymous | [Email](#) | [Homepage](#) | **01.01.05 - 9:02 am** | <#>

I don't have a problem with absentee ballots. I think the problem in Washington, though, is that they only have to be postmarked by election day, whereas in just about every other state they have to actually be received by election day. That's why close elections in Washington take so long to resolve, because they still have absentee ballots trickling in for several days, or even a week, after the election.

Peter | [Email](#) | [Homepage](#) | **01.01.05 - 12:05 pm** | <#>

Happy New Year everyone.

My 2006 Race of the Day is quite lengthy and has been pre-written.

So, it is time for some cutting and pasting. Let's see how that works....

Corey | [Email](#) | [Homepage](#) | **01.01.05 - 12:52 pm** | <#>

2006 Race of the Day

Special News Year's Day Edition

New York Gubernatorial

currently held by Republican

During the next two years, before the eyes of the political world shift to the Presidential sweepstakes, as much attention will be directed towards New York than anywhere else in America. This year's New York City Mayoral race will serve as a prelude to a highly anticipated race for Governor and an even more highly anticipated race for the United States Senate. Tomorrow, I will talk about the Senate race, but today, I will try to stay focused on the race for Governor of New York.

The nominee for the Democrat Party is all but set in Attorney General Eliott Spitzer. The eventual Republican nominee is still uncertain and how the GOP nominates will determine whether or not Spitzer is a solid favorite, a slight favorite, in a tossup race, or a slight underdog.

Spitzer is one of the new darlings of national Democrats and he clearly sees the New York Governorship as a steppingstone to the White House. Another New York politico who has her sights set on 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue is Senator Hillary Rodham Clinton. There had even been some speculation about Clinton maybe running for Governor but it appears she will seek reelection, and the other Senator Chuck Schumer will not be running as well, leaving Spitzer with what looks like a clear path to the nomination.

This is significant for the Democrats since in the last two elections running to regain the office, 1998, and 2002, the party had bruising and divisive primary processes.

It cannot be denied that the Democrats are as poised as they have been in over a decade to take back the Governorship of New York. However, with nearly two years to go, nothing is for certain and the Republicans will be putting up one heck of a fight in order to hold onto the prime office in this very Democrat leaning state, in which they are not supposed to even be competitive.

New York Republicans also have two major figures with Presidential ambitions, Governor George Pataki and former NYC Mayor Rudy Giuliani. Both are possible opponents for both Spitzer and Clinton and both can either see their nascent White House hopes have a serious surge or take a serious dive depending on the outcome of those

racess.

Pataki has been counted out and underestimated before. In 1994, he was a little known State Senator who was not even expected to be the GOP nominee. When he went up against Mario Cuomo, nobody expected him to actually win, even up to election night. He was then thought of as a sure-fire one termer but won in a landslide. He won a third term very comfortably as well after being counted out at this point in early 2001 against what was supposed to be the unstoppable force of Andrew Cuomo.

New York City Mayors and New York Governors have historically found it difficult to reach a fourth term. Pataki is currently trailing Spitzer in some extremely early polls. However, Pataki is still seen as s

Corey | [Email](#) | [Homepage](#) | **01.01.05 - 12:53 pm** | <#>

Part 2

However, Pataki is still seen as someone who was a strong figure after the terrorist attacks of 2001 and a skilled politician who knows how to reach across traditional party lines. He has been counted out before and has won and he should not be counted out now. November '06 is a long way off.

While Pataki is the most likely candidate for Governor among Republicans, it is certainly not a given he will be running. He could seek to join the Bush Administration, he could try to knock off Hillary for the Senate. He knows that if he were to lose a race for reelection, his White House ambitions would be all but over, so he will consider his options very closely.

If the nominee is not Pataki, that brings us to Giuliani who would probably in fact be the strongest potential Republican nominee as he is seen as a strong executive type who received national plaudits for his tenure as Mayor and for the way he dealt with the 9/11 attacks. A Giuliani vs Pataki primary matchup is not going to be happen and Rudy may intend to run against Hillary. Many national Republicans would rather sacrifice their strongest candidate in the race for Governor and allow that race to go Democrat in order to knock off and put an end to the political career of Hillary Clinton. Other Republicans would rather keep what the party already has, the Governorship, and deal with Hillary winning reelection, as she would then be the very likely Presidential nominee, and they view her as extremely beatable.

If not Pataki or Giuliani, the GOP will be at a much larger disadvantage in a race against Spitzer. Outgoing Secretary of State Colin Powell has even been mentioned as both a candidate for Governor and Senate, but that is a longshot. So, for Governor, speculation would be about wealthy business leaders, local government figures, and legislative leaders, and a Member of Congress or two. Perhaps, the most intriguing figure of the "B team" for Republicans would be Secretary of State Randy Daniels, an African-American.

This will be quite a race to watch in the months ahead. The Democrats are feeling good about their chances but any race that will be this big is far from over. Spitzer would be a solid favorite over most Republicans in the state, but only a slight favorite in a race against Governor Pataki, in what would probably turn into a true tossup, and even a slight underdog against Rudy Giuliani.

Politics in the Empire State will be something worth watching.

Corey | [Email](#) | [Homepage](#) | **01.01.05 - 12:54 pm** | <#>

Spitzer should be wary of appearing too cozy with the front-runner status. While it rarely changes the outcome of a race, the candidate who is annointed by the media and the "public mind" as the inevitable winner often faces a drop in popularity. This happened with Corzine in '00 and to a lesser extent Mark Warner here in VA in '01.

However, I expect Pataki to retire and Rudy not to run, leaving Spitzer with VERY little opposition. Perhaps Republicans can dig up a black, evangelical circus midget assistant Secretary of State to run for the office in an attempt to show diversity. Still, I'm sticking with Spitzer.

VCUMIKE | [Email](#) | [Homepage](#) | **01.01.05 - 1:36 pm** | <#>

Also, wasn't there some speculation about Bill "I love phone sex" O'Reilly running for the Republican nomination for either Governor or Senator? I always had fantasies of him running against Hillary, but unfortunately, his moral downfall seems to have made those chances quite slim.

I also have a question: Are any of the Republicans in here interested in voting in a primary for either Rudy Giuliani (Adulterer, divorcee, pro-choice and pro-gay) or George Pataki (Pro-choice, Pro-gay, favors separation of Church and State)? I don't understand why anyone (including them) would think they have a chance at all to win the nomination.

VCUMIKE | [Email](#) | [Homepage](#) | **01.01.05 - 1:51 pm** | <#>

I had not heard about O'Reilly considering a bid for office, just Hannitty.

However, he would not be the first Bill in Hillary's life who enjoys phone sex with women other than his wife.

As to Mike's question, I cannot envision myself supporting Giuliani nor Pataki in a Presidential primary against some other candidates, and I doubt that they would win the

Presidential nomination, but they are just fine for NY and either Governor or Senate.

Have a good day everyone.

Corey | [Email](#) | [Homepage](#) | **01.01.05 - 2:13 pm** | <#>

California Lt Governor race 2006 poll:

Tom McClintock (R): 43.6%

John Garamendi (D): 33.1%

or

Tom McClintock (R): 45.8%

Jackie Speier (D): 25.8%

Poll conduted by Greensburgh Group and US Field Research

Kyle | [Email](#) | [Homepage](#) | **01.01.05 - 2:22 pm** | <#>

My New Year's Message to The Democratic Party:

1. GET TOUGH!!

Toughness is the key. More campaigning with Union Guys standing behind the Candidate. Not dopey looking people with Union T-Shirts, but ACTUAL Union Guys. Start standing up for the working man/ woman.

You can't just be the party of the Working Class. Everything the Party does has to Scream WORKING CLASS.

2. Oppose American EMPIRE, not America. Talk about returning to the old days of an American Republic. One where we try to focus on making a More Perfect Union right here in America. We are the United States of America, not the Holy American Empire.

3. This Idea may be a little too late, but it involves Toughness. You should have gone after The Bush Religious Right base. He was able to pander and give in to these people without any pressure on him. We are talking about people Who believe there is going to be a Temple Built in Israel which will bring about the End of the World. This is THEIR BIGGEST WEAKNESS.

In the past one of the Democrats strengths was Hollywood stars, well the Republicans recognized this and went after it. They've turned it into a weakness. Well, guess what we can do the same. Turn the Religious right into their weakness.

4. OH, and lets say you are a National Political Party and your candidate is being Labeled a flip Flopper. HOW ABOUT protect your candidate and not leave him out their to defend Guaranteed. It was rather PATHETIC.

5. Why give up on Small States???? For Instance, Montana Went to Bush 60% - %40. Okay, seems like a lot. However a 40,000 vote switch wakes it a Dead Heat, 50-50. Consider that you lost Ohio by over 100,000 votes. People aren't set in their views as much as you might think. The 40% that went for Kerry means they were COMPLETELY Against Bush, because Kerry was Non-existent in Montana. That's a 40% Head Start.

Also making a small state in the Middle of the country which is supposed to be Guaranteed Bush into a Tossup would have changed Kerry's image. The Media would go Crazy. Montana a Dead Heat???? It could have also created a momentum swing in other states like Colorado and in other rural areas in bigger states.

Also Consider that Montana Has basically a Democratic Government. A couple of Backdoor deals could gain some local support. ALL POLITICS IS LOCAL right? YOU are A POLITICAL PARTY. 40,000 people. Kerry could shake 40,000 people's hand, easy. He had 6 months to do it. Pick a different VP that could have gone into a state like that as well.

how's this | [Email](#) | [Homepage](#) | **01.01.05 - 2:30 pm** | <#>

McClintock. Good luck. The polls purely reflect name recognition. McClintock ran against Arnold (how interested is Arnie going to be in helping him out?) and before that nearly won the Comptroller's race. My guess for '06: Arnold runs a campaign completely centered on himself (who else?), wins big and brings no other Repubs into office with him. Dems run the down-ballot offices and keep the legislature.

VCUMIKE | [Email](#) | [Homepage](#) | **01.01.05 - 2:39 pm** | <#>

Also Jackie Speier is a VERY successful State Sen, known for getting a lot of legislation passed in CA. In addition to that, she was an aide to Leo Ryan, and was shot 5 times in Guyana when Ryan was assassinated by Jim Jones' People's Temple.

VCUMIKE | [Email](#) | [Homepage](#) | **01.01.05 - 2:44 pm** | <#>

Maybe I should post this at the Friday thread (everyone is being drawn slowly back to this terrible habit for 2005 after a 12-hour hiatus; so much for New Year's Resolutions).

Anyway, Happy New Year.

I'd be interested in others' reactions to Fred Barnes column in yesterday's *Wall Street Journal* (yes, I do read the WSJ, including the opinion pages, several times a week, partly on the advice we young socialists got from Michael Harrington 35 years ago). I think Mr Barnes has some telling points, but some of his more precise data seem shaky (e.g. the number of state legislators in each party) and he seems to be extrapolating more than the data warrant. I'm going to try and catch the first sunbeams of 2005 (or rather sunbeams from the first day of 2005) so I may not hang around to respond immediately. Someone also ought to go visit the OpinionJournal.com link below and click "Reader Responses"; I'm sure the average contributor here, of whatever belief, could do better and write more knowledgeably than the letters that OpinionJournal has printed so far.)

This will be in several parts, because it was a long column.

[The Incredible Shrinking Dems](#)

It was an annus horribilis for America's minority party.

BY FRED BARNES

[Saturday, January 1, 2005 12:01 a.m. EST]

George W. Bush got more votes in winning re-election than the entire population of France. He improved his share of the vote among Latinos, women, African-Americans, Jews and Catholics. Winning a plurality of states along the Mississippi River has guaranteed presidential victory since 1912. Mr. Bush won a majority. This year, says Democratic pollster Peter Hart, "a sense of Republicanism crept up the river. The president won Missouri, which was always a tossup state, by more than 7%. Iowa flipped his direction, and in Minnesota and Wisconsin, we waited all night to find out that Kerry had just barely carried those states." So the Upper Midwest, following the South, Southwest, Plains, and Rocky Mountains, is now trending Republican.

There's another measure of Republican (and Bush) success in 2004. For the first time in more than a century, a Republican president won re-election as his party improved its hold on the House and Senate while increasing its majority of governorships (28 now) and maintaining control of a plurality of state legislatures (20). At the same time, Republicans held a majority of state legislators--a feat they initially achieved in 2002 after a half-century in the minority.

And don't forget what Democrats insisted for decades was their path to sure victory. If Democrats could match Republican campaign spending, energize their base, dramatically increase voter turnout, and provoke a robust debate on big issues, they'd win the White House and probably a whole lot more. Well, they managed all of that in 2004. The result: A Republican won with the first p

[Let's start again from the top; I didn't realize how wordy I was.]

[The Incredible Shrinking Dems](#)

It was an annus horribilis for America's minority party.

BY FRED BARNES

[Saturday, January 1, 2005 12:01 a.m. EST]

George W. Bush got more votes in winning re-election than the entire population of France. He improved his share of the vote among Latinos, women, African-Americans, Jews and Catholics. Winning a plurality of states along the Mississippi River has guaranteed presidential victory since 1912. Mr. Bush won a majority. This year, says Democratic pollster Peter Hart, "a sense of Republicanism crept up the river. The president won Missouri, which was always a tossup state, by more than 7%. Iowa flipped his direction, and in Minnesota and Wisconsin, we waited all night to find out that Kerry had just barely carried those states." So the Upper Midwest, following the South, Southwest, Plains, and Rocky Mountains, is now trending Republican.

There's another measure of Republican (and Bush) success in 2004. For the first time in more than a century, a Republican president won re-election as his party improved its hold on the House and Senate while increasing its majority of governorships (28 now) and maintaining control of a plurality of state legislatures (20). At the same time, Republicans held a majority of state legislators--a feat they initially achieved in 2002 after a half-century in the minority.

And don't forget what Democrats insisted for decades was their path to sure victory. If Democrats could match Republican campaign spending, energize their base, dramatically increase voter turnout, and provoke a robust debate on big issues, they'd win the White House and probably a whole lot more. Well, they managed all of that in 2004. The result: A Republican won with the first presidential majority since 1988. Mr. Bush touted an agenda of bold conservative reform. The last time a Democrat won as an unalloyed liberal was 1964.

Democrats and the media have been reluctant to spotlight the breadth and depth of Republican strength in 2004. Strangely, so have Republicans. It's almost as if they don't believe their own good fortune. "We're no longer a 49% nation," says Ken Mehlman, Mr. Bush's campaign manager in 2004 and now the Republican national chairman, in a breathtaking understatement. And Mr. Mehlman warns that the Republican majority is "not overwhelming" and won't produce "automatic victories." True, but Republicans have the presidency and the most senators (55) since 1931, and are near their modern peak in the House (232). They have all but completed the sweeping political realignment they

could only dream about a generation ago. In the dark days after the 1964 rout, those dreams seemed quixotic, farfetched, even crazed. Now, they've been realized.

Today, Republicans are in position to pursue a conserv

Dem Socialist Dave | Email | [Homepage](#) | **01.01.05 - 2:52 pm** | <#>

[Fred Barnes' WSJ column, part 2]

Today, Republicans are in position to pursue a conservative agenda more sweeping than even Reagan's. Mr. Bush is preparing to propose the partial privatization of Social Security. That's ground on which Reagan feared to tread. Then Mr. Bush plans to seek simplification of the tax code far beyond what Reagan achieved in 1986. And from there, the agenda turns to curbing trial lawyers, expanding faith-based programs, filling Supreme Court vacancies with conservatives, and more.

Where are Democrats? They're desperately seeking to preserve every government program and benefit enacted since the days of the New Deal. The problem for them is that the New Deal paradigm--the belief that Washington could endlessly improve people's lives--has lost its appeal. Mr. Bush discovered this the hard way. He pushed a Medicare prescription drug benefit through Congress in 2003, expecting it to boost his popularity. It didn't. The program drew disapproving poll numbers. His newer idea of an "ownership society" hasn't quite replaced the New Deal paradigm, but it has a chance.

Meanwhile, Republicans and Democrats are experiencing an extraordinary reversal of roles. Democrats were once the inclusive party of the "big tent." Republicans now have a bigger tent. Social liberals like Rudy Giuliani and Arnold Schwarzenegger were prominent speakers at the GOP convention. Social conservatives were virtually nonexistent at the Democratic convention. Democrats have embraced a series of ideological litmus tests on abortion, gay rights, and embryonic stem-cell research. Republicans haven't.

What's more damaging politically, Democrats have become the party of higher taxes. The debate among Democratic presidential contenders this year was over whether to repeal all or just some of Mr. Bush's tax cuts. More recently, Republican Senator Lindsey Graham of South Carolina has sought to win Democratic support for Social Security reform by promising to pay for it with a huge increase in payroll taxes.

On foreign policy, Democrats traditionally were idealistic internationalists in favor of an assertive U.S. presence in the world ready to oppose various tyrannies. They've abdicated that role to Republicans. The chief foreign-policy idealist today is Mr. Bush, who champions a crusade for democracy in Afghanistan, Iraq, the Middle East and elsewhere. Democrats flirt with isolationism.

* * *

[Fred Barnes' WSJ column, part 3]

¶ One of the most talked about political concepts of the early 21st century was "the emerging Democratic majority." It was supposed to begin emerging in 2002 and 2004, but clearly it didn't. Adherents of the Democratic idea blame the 9/11 terrorist attack for upsetting the Democratic trend temporarily. The truth, of course, is there wasn't a Democratic trend in the first place. The concept assumed that Democratic vote levels in the late 1990s among women, Latinos, African Americans and young, college-educated urbanites was a floor. And since these groups were growing at a fast pace, the Democratic vote would soar and Democrats would emerge as the dominant party again, as they were from the '30s to the '90s.

The floor turned out to be a ceiling. It's Republicans who have gained among these groups (with the possible exception of young metropolitan sophisticates). Take women. Since 1996, the gender gap--the difference between the male vote for Republicans and the female vote for Democrats--has shrunk. President Clinton won women by 16 percentage points in 1996. Al Gore won by 11 points in 2000. But John Kerry's edge in 2004 was a mere three points. And among white women without a college education, a poll by Democracy Corps found Mr. Kerry trailing Mr. Bush by 23 points.

Anna Greenberg, one of the smartest of the younger Democratic consultants, explains the Democratic trouble with women this way: "Despite the economic interests, socially conservative women, white, blue-collar women, have moved increasingly into the Republican camp, primarily around social and cultural issues that include perceived moral decline, abortion and reproductive health, challenges to women's traditional roles in society and family, and gay rights. . . . These voters swung to Bush as he tapped into their social conservatism, their support for his approach to the war on terrorism, and their admiration of his faith."

With Latinos, the story is similar. Traditional values, respect for religious faith, and support for entrepreneurship are tugging them into the Republican Party. The Republican share of the Latino vote grew from 21% in 1996 to 35% in 2000 and to 44% in 2004. The 44% figure in the exit poll is disputed by some Democrats, but if the jump was only to 40%, that's still a significant gain and represents an even more significant trend.

Republican gains among Jews (19% in 2000 to 25% in 2004) and blacks (9% to 13%) were smaller. And Democrats point to the youth vote as predicative of a bright Democratic future. Mr. Kerry prevailed among voters aged 18-29 by nine percentage points. But there's no evidence that younger voters are the wave of the future in presidential contests. Mr. Clinton won them by 19 points in his 1996 re-election. Democrats went on to lose the next two presidential elections.

* * *

Dem Socialist Dave | Email | [Homepage](#) | **01.01.05 - 2:55 pm** | <#>

BLAH BLAH BLAH BLAH BLAH

how's this | Email | [Homepage](#) | **01.01.05 - 2:57 pm** | <#>

[Fred Barnes' WSJ column, 4th & final part]

¶ Some Democratic strategists disparage the notion that increased Republican turnout in the rapidly growing exurban and rural areas matters in national races. Not enough voters live there, they say. This amounts to self-justification. Democrats largely ignored these areas in their massive voter registration drive in 2004 and regarded Republican registration claims as imaginary. But without a spike in turnout outside major urban areas, Mr. Bush would have lost Ohio and New Mexico and perhaps Iowa, thus Mr. Kerry would be president-elect. After the election, Ronald Brownstein and Richard Rainey of the *Los Angeles Times* found that Mr. Bush captured 97 of the 100 fastest-growing counties in the country, most of them on the fringe of major metropolitan areas.

The Republican surge in recent years should not have been a shock. The 200-plus years of American political history have seen a series of realignments that shift power from one party to another (1800, 1828, 1860, 1896, 1932, now). The chief theorist of realignment, political scientist Walter Dean Burnham, says they occur when the dominant party is unable to cope with new demands from frustrated voters. That prompts a breakthrough election, the latest in 1994. If the new political arrangement "turns out to be permanent," it's a realignment that's likely to endure for decades. The 2004 election "consolidated" the realignment, Burnham says.

There's reason to believe Republican dominance, absent a catastrophe such as a depression, will last. Yes, there are sure to be setbacks. Even as Republicans have ascended, three states--Illinois, New Jersey, and (this year) Colorado--have trended Democratic. But with luck, good leadership and intelligent nurturing of the center-right conservative coalition, Republicans should have the upper hand for years to come.

Mr. Barnes is executive editor of The Weekly Standard and co-host of "The Beltway Boys" on Fox News Channel.

Dem Socialist Dave | Email | [Homepage](#) | **01.01.05 - 2:57 pm** | <#>

Much more serious but less ponderous matter:

Today's *Providence Journal* reports that the night-club fire in Buenos Aires which killed

175 people bears an eerie similarity to the Station night-club fire which killed 100 in West Warwick, RI, in February 2003 (just after Gov. Don Carcieri, R, assumed office).

I think Gov. Carcieri, who did a very good job with the Station fire in Rhode Island, should consider postponing his State of the State address next week and offer to see if there's any help or advice he could offer the Argentines.

It's not of course as big a disaster as the Tsunami, but it's something significant that's still on a scale within our grasp and knowledge.

And if Gov. Carcieri went, he'd have the support of all Rhode Islanders of whatever politics.

Dem Socialist Dave | Email | [Homepage](#) | **01.01.05 - 3:03 pm** | <#>

I for one am not going to be taking my instructions from Fred Barnes. He uses selected information, as usual. Specifically, he fails to mention that Bush's 9% among black voters was the lowest since Goldwater. How could it go anywhere but up? Or that Reagan and Bush I won nearly 40% of the Jewish vote in the 1980's. Bush is betting all of his chips on the economy doing well, Social Security Reform AND success in Iraq. This from an administration that can't even define success in that region.

VCUMIKE | [Email](#) | [Homepage](#) | **01.01.05 - 3:06 pm** | <#>

In New York, I've been a bit surprised that one name that has never been mentioned (at least I don't think) in the event neither Pataki or Guiliani runs for Governor is that of Lieutenant Governor Mary Donahue. Has she already ruled it out?

Peter | [Email](#) | [Homepage](#) | **01.01.05 - 3:15 pm** | <#>

Happy Aught-Five y'all.

It's a whole new year of arguments, insults, and debates to look forward to. Hope your years are happy and bright.

Anyone care to share any resolutions or fun NYE stories? Or should we just argue about recounts and revotes.

Ragnar Danashold | Email | [Homepage](#) | **01.01.05 - 3:22 pm** | <#>

You're right VCUMIKE. And, Lieberman was the VP in 2000, and it was a more moderate ticket. Of course the Jewish vote would go down.

liberalminded | [Email](#) | [Homepage](#) | **01.01.05 - 3:28 pm** | <#>

Kerry won Florida, he just doesn't have the balls to call for a revote. If Dean gets the chair, I hope he tells Kerry to freakin' revote in Florida.

Ragnar Danashold | [Email](#) | [Homepage](#) | **01.01.05 - 3:30 pm** | <#>

Democratic Socialists believe that both the economy and society should be run democratically—to meet public needs, not to make profits for a few. To achieve a more just society, many structures of our government and economy must be radically transformed through greater economic and social democracy so that ordinary Americans can participate in the many decisions that affect our lives.

Democracy and socialism go hand in hand. All over the world, wherever the idea of democracy has taken root, the vision of socialism has taken root as well—everywhere but in the United States. Because of this, many false ideas about socialism have developed in the US. With this pamphlet, we hope to answer some of your questions about socialism.

Doesn't socialism mean that the government will own and run everything?

Democratic Socialists do not want to create an all-powerful government bureaucracy. But we do not want big corporate bureaucracies to control our society either. Rather, we believe that social and economic decisions should be made by those whom they most affect.

Today, corporate executives who answer only to themselves and a few wealthy stockholders make basic economic decisions affecting millions of people. Resources are used to make money for capitalists rather than to meet human needs. We believe that the workers and consumers who are affected by economic institutions should own and control them. Social ownership could take many forms, such as worker-owned cooperatives or publicly owned enterprises managed by workers and consumer representatives. Democratic Socialists favor as much decentralization as possible.

While the large concentrations of capital in industries such as energy and steel may necessitate some form of state ownership, many consumer-goods industries might be best run as cooperatives. Democratic Socialists have long rejected the belief that the whole economy should be centrally planned. While we believe that democratic planning can shape major social investments like mass transit, housing, and energy, market mechanisms are needed to determine the demand for many consumer goods.

Hasn't socialism been discredited by the collapse of Communism in the USSR and Eastern Europe?

Socialists have been among the harshest critics of authoritarian Communist states. Just because their bureaucratic elites called them "socialist" did not make it so; they also called their regimes "democratic." We applaud the authentic democratic revolutions that have transformed the former Communist bloc. We also expect that the socialist parties that are reemerging in Eastern Europe will be essential in the struggle to protect workers' rights, to ensure equality for women, and to promote social justice. The improvement of people's lives requires real democracy without ethnic rivalries and/or new forms of authoritarianism. Democratic Socialists will continue to play a key role in that struggle throughout the world. The fall of Communism should

Ragnar Danashold | Email | [Homepage](#) | **01.01.05 - 3:50 pm** | <#>

What the hell? I must have accidentally pasted that. Hell, I didn't even know I had it on there!

Ragnar Danashold | Email | [Homepage](#) | **01.01.05 - 3:52 pm** | <#>

I think Fred Barnes is onto to something, but only in part. Any party's standard-bearer can be unusually good or bad while the rest of the party does the opposite (Clinton trumps Dole, GOP keeps House and Senate, etc.).

But something HAS happened. The GOP has pretty much stopped being the "small government" party in practice while retaining it in rhetoric. People get Social Security AND Social Security reform under the GOP. They get prescription drugs and chatter about litigation reform (for cheaper prescription drugs) from the GOP. They get a strong national defense AND a party willing to use it. They get tax cuts AND bigger spending.

The Dems have been severely outflanked. While the GOP still has enough "small gov't Republicans" in its folds (who simply can't swallow the Libertarian Party), it has roped the moderates, too. The Dems offer what? MORE money for Medicare and prescription drugs (which people translate to as MORE TAXES). They are unwilling to reform social security when everyone knows it'll go bust. They are unwilling to tackle litigation reform when everyone knows lawyers create increases in insurance premiums and higher costs for prescription drugs. The Democrats constituent groups force them to support the status quo and to promise MORE spending but say they'll balance the budget--usually by saying they'll raise taxes "on the rich" and cut "waste" in government. This doesn't ring true to most people.

In conclusion: A minority party only regains power by being the agent of change. The

GOP has successfully positioned itself as the agent of change as the MAJORITY while also convincing most people they will not radically upset the status quo (that is, social security stays, but is better; prescription drugs can occur but w/ insitutional reforms, etc.)

The Dems offer more spending, more tax hikes, and no reform. They're in a bind. Demographically, more women and more minorities are middle-class and white collar. Some may stay as Democrats but they learn the taxes will be on THEM or at the very least, their EMPLOYER or BUSINESS and the platform the Dems offer doesn't smell good anymore as it did when they were young and economically unstable . . .

Swell Guy from Illinois | Email | Homepage | **01.01.05 - 4:14 pm** | <#>

Oh, yeah. Ditto for education. The GOP supports at least SOME kind of public education reform. Most people know public schools are expensive and inefficient and severely lacking in many regards. Maybe the GOP reforms are lukewarm, but they are REFORM ideas. The Dems say we need more spending and will never double-cross the teachers unions. What's the appeal in that?

Anonymous | Email | Homepage | **01.01.05 - 4:17 pm** | <#>

The above "Anonymous" was also from me--Swell Guy from IL

Swell Guy from Illinois | Email | Homepage | **01.01.05 - 4:18 pm** | <#>

The Dems say we need more spending and will never double-cross the teachers unions. What's the appeal in that?

Education policy shouldn't be controlled by the teachers unions, as the dems ed. policy seems to be sub-serviant to.

The point is not to provide more jobs and better pay to a segment of the population.

It is to EDUCATE CHILDREN.

dudeman5685 | Email | Homepage | **01.01.05 - 4:31 pm** | <#>

I'm watching Death Wish, and it interesting to see the cesspool of crime and violence that took place in the cities in the 70s and 80s. And you know the reason? Liberal politicians. They totally let the gangs run the cities. Remember graffiti on the walls in public places? Remember that no one painted over it? It's because their attitude was "oh, criminals are poor disadvantaged people from broken homes..." and all that jazz. (which is totally a slap in the face to the poor people who didnt turn to a life of crime, which happens to be

the majority)

Weekend furloughs for convicted murderers???? This is why in almost every state in the 70s and 80s, everyone in suburbs voted Republican. They had to outvote the ridiculous liberals in the cities of New York, Philly, Los Angeles and Chicago

Lawrence | Email | Homepage | **01.01.05 - 5:13 pm** | <#>

Well. ne things for sure...2004 was sure a bad year for Herbert C. Hoover.

Other than being dead for 40 years, he also got slapped around in the primaries and conventions more than any other dead Ex-President.

The is kind of a sucky tribute for a GUY THAT SAVED MILLIONS OF LIVES running the emergency food adminstation in Europe after World War 1.

He established one of the first major think tanks -- the Hoover Institution on War, Peace and Revolution.

The Hoover Dam was his idea, and he is thus the reason most people in NV, AZ, UT, and parts of CA. Finally bringing them into the modern era.

He is the father of the modern organization of the Presidency, through his chairmanship of the 1st and 2nd Hoover Commisions.

How would you like it if you did all those things, but your names is used as a byword 40 years after your death, as a symonym for failure.

I think W. said it best -- Lets just gve Herbert, a rest, shall we?

dudeman5685 | Email | Homepage | **01.01.05 - 8:17 pm** | <#>

In the 1970's and 1980's only four years were under a Democratic President, Jimmy Carter, who was bookended by eight years of Nixon-Ford and twelve of Reagan-Bush. And Pres. Reagan had a Republican Senate for the first six years of his tenure. Warren Burger (appointed by Nixon) was Chief Justice of the Supreme Court from 1969 until 1986, when he was succeeded by Wm Rehnquist (apptd by Reagan). Wm O. Douglas, the most liberal member of the Supreme Court retired in 1975.

I don't have all the names at my fingertips, but there were a lot of Republican Governors, Attorneys-General and Mayors in those decades, too. For example, Ronald Reagan, Ed Reinecke, George Deukmejian (AG), Nelson Rockefeller (considered a liberal but also the author of outlandishly draconian drug laws), George Romney, James Rhodes, et al.

Pulling out, essentially at random, a 1979 World Almanac, here are some big-state governors after the Nov. 1978 elections, ranked roughly by 1976-1980 population:

Calif: Jerry Brown (D)
NY: Hugh Carey (D)
Texas: Bill Clements (R)
Penna: Richard Thornburgh (R)
Ill: James R. Thompson (R)
Ohio: James A. Rhodes (R)

Florida: Bob Graham (D)
Mich: Wm Milliken (R)
NJ: Brendan Byrne (D)

Mass: Edward King (D)
NC: James Hunt (D)
Mo: Joseph Teasdale (D)
Va: John Dalton (R)

Ga: George Busbee (D)
Ind: Otis Bowen (R)
Wisc: Lee Dreyfus (R)

So, while obviously many Democrats had a responsibility to address urban crime and blight, so did many Republicans. It's much too facile to blame long-term problems on some liberal folly, when things like the Northward migration of southern farmers, suburbanization and the decline of inner-city factories, rail centers, ports, warehouses and wholesale food markets had a thousand fathers, including the impersonal imperatives of capitalism, trade and technology.

Dem Socialist Dave | Email | [Homepage](#) | **01.01.05 - 8:42 pm** | <#>

Swell Guy from Ill., I think you have a point, but I also think that the GOP is prevented from real reform by its own interest groups.

For example, the prescription drug crisis can't be addressed without impinging on pharmaceutical-manufacturers' profits, which is impossible in this Congress and Administration or in any that are remotely like them.

And on Monday, I start another tax-preparation season with H&R Block. It's far too attractive for politicians of either party (most notoriously Al Gore) to ditch the sound conclusions of Bill Bradley's and Bill Roth's bipartisan tax reform of 1986 and offer programs that rely on new credits and deductions instead of "big government bureaucracies". Every one of those becomes another line on the tax form supported by at least one more schedule and often several incredibly-arcanely calculations (e.g. Alternative

Minimum Tax thresholds, IRA contribution limits and "Modified Adjusted Gross Income" which is defined differently for every single benefit) that daunt even me, let alone Joe & Jane Q. Average Taxpayer.

For education (as many of the younger contributors know well), retirement, health care and rearing children, there are at a minimum five different credits, adjustments to income or deductions that are often incompatible with each other. You have to pick which of four or five very different education credits (Hope, Lifetime Learning, Student Loan Interest, Coverdell Educ'l Savings Acc't, work-related deduction, etc.) will give you the best break. Similarly for retirement and health care. Although this will (thank heaven) change next tax year, there are at present five different definitions of "qualifying child": a kid whose child-care may give you a credit may not qualify you for Earned Income Credit, or vice-versa.

Dem Socialist Dave | Email | [Homepage](#) | **01.01.05 - 9:07 pm** | <#>

Dem Soc - Crime rates in the cities have more to do with the mayor than the governor, and certainly the president. Mayors like David Dinkins and Ed Koch are why these cities were such hellholes

Lawrence | Email | [Homepage](#) | **01.01.05 - 9:13 pm** | <#>

Lawrence, I think you're right that mayors have more to do with their own cities than governors or presidents, but it's far too simple to say that "Mayors like David Dinkins and Ed Koch why these cities were such hellholes."

Very few mayors have that much power, especially today but even then (except in machine throwbacks like Chicago). If you've ever had occasion to study or watch how municipal governments operate, there may be some room for folly but there just isn't that much room for manoeuvre. Most if not all of your revenue comes from the property tax, much of which goes to schools over which you have very little control. If you raise property taxes too much or too fast, you not only cause economic drag, you drive middle-class people to the suburbs and punish hard-working families. But if you don't have enough revenue, you can't hire or equip enough police, firefighters, trash-gatherers, housing inspectors and teachers.

Dem Socialist Dave | Email | [Homepage](#) | **01.01.05 - 10:14 pm** | <#>

I left the word "are" out of my citation from Lawrence's post, which citation should have read:

“Mayors like David Dinkins and Ed Koch are why these cities were such

hellholes”

Sorry I made it incoherent and ungrammatical.

Dem Socialist Dave | Email | [Homepage](#) | **01.01.05 - 10:19 pm** | <#>

I think the fact that Bloomberg is not hated so to speak, bodes well for his chances. Yes, he is seen as sort of bland and not an inspiring figure, but he will not inspire much passion into opposing him.

If New York City is clean, the trash is picked up on time, workers are not on strike, crime is down, etc., people may just want to stick with what they know is working and not take a chance on shaking things up too much.

I wonder how many New Yorkers really want to shake things up after the past 12 years.

Corey | [Email](#) | [Homepage](#) | **01.01.05 - 10:20 pm** | <#>

In Chicago, Mayor Daley is certainly not a beloved figure but the city is clean, the trash is picked up, he planted a bunch of flowers, he built some parks. He is Mayor for life.

Corey | [Email](#) | [Homepage](#) | **01.01.05 - 10:21 pm** | <#>

Dean for DNC chair!

Joey Joe Joe | Email | [Homepage](#) | **01.01.05 - 10:25 pm** | <#>

We need a democrat with balls, not some pussy-wimp like Clinton, Daschle, Gephardt.....

Joey Joe Joe | Email | [Homepage](#) | **01.01.05 - 10:27 pm** | <#>

If she wins reelection, Hillary will be the 2008 nominee. She probably thinks she has more balls than anyone else in the party of course.

Rush has some line about her keeping the testicles of all other Democrats in a lockbox.

Corey | [Email](#) | [Homepage](#) | **01.01.05 - 10:30 pm** | <#>

Yes, and we all Know ChickenHawk Listens to Rush All Day.

Go ahead, you probably know the line by heart.

Anonymous | Email | Homepage | **01.01.05 - 10:44 pm** | <#>

I think Corey has a point. Ed Koch and Rudolph Giuliani were nothing if not confrontational and polarizing (like John Silber in Massachusetts). Maybe New Yorkers just want competent government and a quiet life.

(Abe Beame rather than John Lindsay or Fiorello La Guardia.)

Dem Socialist Dave | Email | [Homepage](#) | **01.01.05 - 10:48 pm** | <#>

Yeah, that Freddy Ferrer fella (try saying that 10 times fast) is kind of polarizing and ideological and will shake things up. Is that really a risk the city wants to take away from the current state of affairs?

Plus, Ferrer has a mustache like Dinkins.

Corey | [Email](#) | [Homepage](#) | **01.01.05 - 10:50 pm** | <#>

Yes, and we all Know ChickenHawk Listens to Rush All Day

uuuhhhh, do you know what "Chicken Hawk" means in pervert slang?

dudeman5685 | Email | Homepage | **01.02.05 - 12:10 am** | <#>

DEFEND THE HOOVER LEGACY!

<http://hoover.nara.gov/>

dudeman5685 | Email | Homepage | **01.02.05 - 12:11 am** | <#>

Why the Democrats Keep Losing

Joshua Muravchik

The aftermath befitted the morrow of a civil war. Tens of thousands of Americans visited the website of the Canadian immigration service to learn how they could take themselves into exile. A Florida psychotherapist reported treating more than a dozen people for sudden depression. "Hard times, brutish times, lie ahead," intoned the New Republic.

The New York Times turned its op-ed page into a kind of wailing wall, where a procession of mourners poured forth their laments and imprecations. Garry Wills: “We now resemble [Europe] less than we do our putative enemies . . . al Qaeda [and] Saddam Hussein’s Sunni loyalists.” Thomas Friedman: The Bush people “have used . . . religious energy to promote divisions and intolerance at home and abroad.” Maureen Dowd: “jihad in America. . . . One party controls all power. . . . One nation dominates the world.”

The proverbial visitor from afar might have been astonished to learn that all of this rhetorical tearing of hair and rending of garments was occasioned by nothing more than the results of a presidential election, and not even the wailers themselves could have doubted that this election would be followed by another four years hence. Clearly something else was going on.

To be sure, George W. Bush was hated. He had been the object of a startling amount of contumely during his first term of office, a phenomenon that had already occasioned much comment in the public prints. Some of this strong sentiment was presumably due to the taint of illegitimacy that had attached to his victory in the 2000 election. Leaving aside the contested, court-ordered outcome of the vote-counting in Florida, Bush had received fewer votes nationally than his opponent and had acceded to the presidency thanks only to an anachronism in our political system. Although this had happened twice before in our history, the last time was in the 19th century, and to many it appeared excruciatingly unfair, not to mention undemocratic.

[Liz](#) | [Email](#) | [Homepage](#) | **01.02.05 - 12:11 am** | <#>

To be sure, George W. Bush was hated. He had been the object of a startling amount of contumely during his first term of office, a phenomenon that had already occasioned much comment in the public prints. Some of this strong sentiment was presumably due to the taint of illegitimacy that had attached to his victory in the 2000 election. Leaving aside the contested, court-ordered outcome of the vote-counting in Florida, Bush had received fewer votes nationally than his opponent and had acceded to the presidency thanks only to an anachronism in our political system. Although this had happened twice before in our history, the last time was in the 19th century, and to many it appeared excruciatingly unfair, not to mention undemocratic.

But in November 2004, the fact that Bush’s second term would now be legitimate beyond any doubt seemed only to compound the hatred. Several of the President’s detractors hastened to suggest that his relatively narrow margin of victory—amounting to 3 percent of the popular vote—should not be taken as a “mandate.” Whether they would have said the same had Bush’s Democratic opponent won by a like amount is doubtful.

[Liz](#) | [Email](#) | [Homepage](#) | **01.02.05 - 12:11 am** | <#>

The New York Times, for example, has regularly questioned the presence of a mandate in

recent elections—but only when the winner has been a Republican. In 1980, when Ronald Reagan bested incumbent President Jimmy Carter by 10 percentage points, the paper's editors observed that his “mandate,” a word they themselves put in suspicion-arousing quotation marks, had “little policy content,” a position they reiterated four years later when Reagan won reelection over Walter Mondale by a whopping 18 percentage points (a “lonely landslide” and “a personal victory with little precise policy mandate”). Nor could the 8-point victory by Bush's father over Michael Dukakis “fairly be called a mandate,” asserted the paper in 1988.

Whenever a Democrat has won, by contrast, the Times has perceived things differently. After Bill Clinton's first victory (by 6 percentage points) in 1992, the editors commented: “The test now will be how quickly President-elect Clinton can convert his mandate into momentum.” When he won reelection (by 8 points) in 1996, it repeated the thought—“There can be no question about his mandate”—and added a little civics lesson: “The American people express their clearest opinion about what they want government to do through their choice of chief executive.”

[Liz](#) | [Email](#) | [Homepage](#) | **01.02.05 - 12:12 am** | <#>

Even as the Democrats and their friends in the mainstream media minimized the import of Bush's victory in 2004, it seems likely that their pained response was due precisely to the fact that the Republican victory, if not deep, was undeniably broad. In addition to winning the presidency with an absolute majority of the popular vote (something no Democrat has achieved since Lyndon Johnson in 1964), the Republicans solidified their majorities in the Senate and the House of Representatives. This will be the sixth successive Congress since 1994 in which the Republicans will have controlled both houses.

Nor is the pattern likely to be broken in the short term. Republicans now hold a 30-vote margin in the House; since the advantage of incumbency usually results in to the victory of more than 90 percent of those standing for reelection, this will not be easy to reverse. In the Senate, the Republicans hold a ten-vote edge. There, reelection is a less sure thing, but in the midterm election of 2006 more incumbent Democrats are thought to be at risk than Republicans. Meanwhile, the GOP continues to enjoy a lead of 29 to 21 in governorships, including those of the four most populous states: California, Texas, New York, and Florida.

As if all this were not unnerving enough, the Republicans won in a year when many things had seemed promising for Democrats. The war in Iraq was proving to be much tougher sledding than originally hoped, and throughout the year Bush was buffeted by unfavorable headlines—a mounting insurgency, intelligence failures about weapons of mass destruction, prisoner abuse, the withdrawal of allies, and more. Although it is supposedly difficult to oust a sitting President in wartime, both Johnson and Harry S. Truman, two incumbents saddled with wars on distant shores that were not going well, declined to seek reelection, presumably in part out of fear they would not win. Nor was

the news from the home front particularly good for Bush. The economy was recovering from recession, but the rebound was weak, generating few jobs and no more than guarded optimism.

[Liz](#) | [Email](#) | [Homepage](#) | **01.02.05 - 12:14 am** | <#>

Adding to the pre-election expectations—and post-election frustrations—of Democrats and liberals was their low regard for the man who beat them. Howell Raines, the former executive editor of the Times, had captured this sentiment in a pre-election essay: “There are signs of the fierce conviction of some voters—and the secret fear of a quieter and perhaps larger group—that George W. Bush is not smart enough to continue as President.” One of these voters apparently was John F. Kerry, who vented to an aide within earshot of an “embedded” Newsweek correspondent: “I can’t believe I’m losing to this idiot.” By contrast, most Democrats felt, with reason, that unlike Mondale or Dukakis or Al Gore before him, Kerry had proved to be an effective, if uncharismatic, campaigner.

Other political factors appeared to be breaking in favor of the Democrats as well. Only two weeks before the election, these were summed up by the Democratic strategist James Carville:

If we can’t win this damn election, with a Democratic party more unified than ever before, with us having raised as much money as the Republicans, with 55 percent of the country believing [the U.S. is] heading in the wrong direction, with our candidate having won all three debates, and with our side being more passionate about the outcome than theirs—if we can’t win this one, then we can’t win [anything]!

[Liz](#) | [Email](#) | [Homepage](#) | **01.02.05 - 12:16 am** | <#>

I see where you are going with this, Liz.

Visceral HATRED of the President and the party in power during war times seems awfully close to sedition.

The libs were MUCH more Gung-ho about OPPOSEING the Iraq war, than WINNING the War on Terror.

Not that the Right didn't face similier problems in 1940.

[dudeman5685](#) | [Email](#) | [Homepage](#) | **01.02.05 - 12:17 am** | <#>

and with our side being more passionate about the outcome than theirs

That isn't true.

We have much more spirit.

Bush, Bush
He's our man!
If he can't do it
nobody can
Invaded Iraq
So in the mid-east
We have a niche
He's gonna make John Kerry
his

dudeman5685 | Email | Homepage | **01.02.05 - 12:20 am** | <#>

Well, I guess he's already done that!

dudeman5685 | Email | Homepage | **01.02.05 - 12:21 am** | <#>

In addition to the specter of long-term status as an opposition party, another root of Democratic distress lay in the prominent role played in the campaign by “born-again” or evangelical Christians, a constituency with whom Bush identified himself. Hence the numerous overwrought references to the looming dangers of theocracy, fundamentalism, and even “jihad.”

According to the standard version, Karl Rove, the tactical genius behind Bush, had contrived to mobilize large numbers of these religious zealots whose votes, explained the Times columnist Paul Krugman, were “motivated, above all, by their opposition to abortion and gay rights (and in the background, opposition to minority rights).” The primary devices for rousing these Americans from their previous political lethargy were federal and state initiatives against gay marriage; once gotten to the ballot box, they could be counted on to pull the lever (or press the screen) for Bush and the GOP ticket.

For those subscribing to this analysis, Rove’s master plan was vindicated when the main exit poll revealed that a larger proportion of voters (22 percent) named “moral values” than any other issue as the one that most determined their ballot; these same voters chose Bush over Kerry by a ratio of 80 to 18. But the analysis turns out to be faulty in almost every respect. It is probably true that more evangelicals voted in 2004 than before. But more people in all religious and other demographic categories did, too, and the evidence strongly suggests that evangelicals increased their vote no more than the rest of the population.

According to the standard version, Karl Rove, the tactical genius behind Bush, had contrived to mobilize large numbers of these religious zealots whose votes, explained the Times columnist Paul Krugman, were “motivated, above all, by their opposition to abortion and gay rights (and in the background, opposition to minority rights).” The primary devices for rousing these Americans from their previous political lethargy were federal and state initiatives against gay marriage; once gotten to the ballot box, they could be counted on to pull the lever (or press the screen) for Bush and the GOP ticket.

For those subscribing to this analysis, Rove’s master plan was vindicated when the main exit poll revealed that a larger proportion of voters (22 percent) named “moral values” than any other issue as the one that most determined their ballot; these same voters chose Bush over Kerry by a ratio of 80 to 18. But the analysis turns out to be faulty in almost every respect. It is probably true that more evangelicals voted in 2004 than before. But more people in all religious and other demographic categories did, too, and the evidence strongly suggests that evangelicals increased their vote no more than the rest of the population.

It may be impossible to know for sure, because the 2004 exit poll was the first to ask voters specifically whether or not they considered themselves “evangelical or born-again.” But the proportion identifying themselves as Protestants or other non-Catholic Christians—54 percent—remained exactly the same as in the last two elections. In theory, one might posit a significant increase in the evangelical share of the vote in 2004 counterbalanced by an equivalent decrease in the non-evangelical Protestant share, but there is no evidence of this, and the hypothesis is far-fetched.

Nor can we know what to make of the datum that 22 percent chose “moral values” as their most important issue—a choice not on offer before. For one thing, as Charles Krauthammer has pointed out, the term was a catch-all, less specific than the other domestic issues—the economy/jobs, taxes, health care, education—listed individually on the menu presented to respondents. Had the list offered gay marriage, abortion, and crime as discrete choices, the “moral-values” group would have fractured, and none of the individual pieces would have loomed so large. Iraq and terrorism were listed separately, and were chosen respectively by 15 and 19 percent. Had they been aggregated, as in previous elections, into the single category of “foreign policy” or “world affairs,” then the 34 percent presumably choosing this category would have overshadowed the “moral-values” group. (None of this, of course, is to deny that moral values were important, as they always are.)

If the principal claims about the role of evangelical voters were false, it does seem that this group participated in the election with more élan and self-confidence than in the past.

Anecdotal evidence suggests that a sizable contingent of Bush volunteers was drawn from their ranks, perhaps buoyed by a President who has testified to being one of them.

But this, even if true, does not suffice to explain the vituperation aimed at them. For that, the cause seems to be twofold. First, to the liberal pundits, the religiosity of Bush and many of his supporters is in itself disturbing or repugnant: they are seen as utterly close-minded and impervious to reason. “We’re entering another dark age,” worried Maureen Dowd, adding that religious voters were motivated by “the fear of scientific progress.” “It’s scary,” confessed her fellow Times columnist Bob Herbert. “How do you make a rational political pitch to people who have put that part of their brain on hold?”

The second reason had to do with the palpable need of the Democrats to blame their defeat on the shortcomings not of themselves but of the electorate. Some of them have done this quite regularly in recent decades. Reagan’s victories in the 1980’s were ascribed to the personal and economic venality of the voters: “selfishness, this greed, this new championship of caring only for yourself,” as Mondale put it in the closing days of the 1984 election. Now, Bush’s triumph was ascribed to another base characteristic: religious primitivism. Blind to the irony, some liberal commentators in 2004 even began to bemoan the electorate’s lack of selfishness. “Many of these formerly nonvoting white evangelicals are remaining true to their unworldliness,” commented the New Yorker’s Hendrik Hertzberg sardonically. “In voting for [Bush] they have voted against their own material (and, some might imagine, spiritual) well-being.”

[Liz](#) | [Email](#) | [Homepage](#) | **01.02.05 - 12:27 am** | <#>

Were the voters voting against themselves? And if so, why? Hertzberg’s assertion leads back to the fundamental question of the election: why, when the Democrats had all the advantages enumerated by Carville, and when the bad news from Iraq was continuing to roll in, did Bush win? And why did Kerry lose?

Bush did win—and not merely as a result of the artful maneuverings of Karl Rove. “From the beginning,” reported Matt Bai in the New York Times Magazine, “Kerry’s advisers said that the election would be principally a referendum on Bush,” whose job-approval ratings hovered around 50-50 throughout the campaign. That such a referendum would work to Kerry’s benefit was reaffirmed by Bill Clinton, the Democrats’ most astute politician. “If you’re the issue in this campaign, you lose,” Clinton told Kerry. “If he’s the issue . . . you win.”

The exit poll showed this to be false. To the question of whether they had voted mainly “for your candidate” or “against his opponent,” the pros outnumbered the antis by a ratio of 69 to 25 percent. Within the group that cast a ballot for negative reasons, more than two-thirds went for Kerry (that is, against Bush), while those who voted for positive reasons favored Bush over Kerry by 59 to 40. Put another way, four-fifths of Bush’s voters felt they were voting mainly in his favor; only one-fifth felt they were in essence voting against Kerry.

Voters citing the economy or Iraq as their main issue went overwhelmingly for Kerry; those naming terrorism or moral values went no less overwhelmingly for Bush. Asked about the qualities of their preferred candidate, those saying he “is intelligent,” “cares about people like me,” and “will bring about needed change” went in large proportions for Kerry; those saying he “has strong religious faith,” “is honest and trustworthy,” “is a strong leader,” “has clear stands on the issues” heavily favored Bush.

Alas, the poll did not ask whether voters had based their choice mostly on issues or on individual qualities, but there is some evidence to suggest that Bush benefited from positive feelings toward him personally. The Times distributed a team of reporters to roughly a half-dozen venues around the country to talk to voters (not to poll them or draw a scientific sample). The conclusion of their pooled experience was this: “The voices of American voters the day after the election fairly shouted that the outcome was not about electoral tactics or issues, but about a fundamental question of character.” There was something most people liked about the President.

There was also something many disliked about Kerry. For all his effectiveness in the debates or on the stump, Kerry’s patrician demeanor was a liability. If Bush’s folksy style and religious conviction put him at one with a large part of his constituency, Kerry spoke to his supporters across a great class divide. “I will fight for you,” he said again and again, inadvertently underscoring the gulf between himself and

[Liz](#) | [Email](#) | [Homepage](#) | **01.02.05 - 12:29 am** | <#>

the chic corners of Manhattan and Hollywood that also hated Bush for his association with the censorious religious Right. As the Times reported, “Dozens of celebrities had thrown their weight behind the Democratic candidate. . . . Sean Penn knocked on doors in New Mexico. Leonardo DiCaprio, Jon Bon Jovi, and Bruce Springsteen tirelessly stumped for Mr. Kerry.”

This was a mixed blessing, since the performers furnished frequent and ample reminders of what many Americans find objectionable in their wares. But Kerry seemed oblivious to the problem. At a star-studded benefit performance for the Kerry campaign at Radio City Music Hall, Whoopi Goldberg pointed to her crotch and said: “Keep Bush where it belongs and not in the White House.” Following this, Kerry came out and declared: “Every performer tonight . . . conveyed to you the heart and soul of our country.” A couple of weeks later, the rap “artist” Eminem released the catchy antiwar lyric: “We gonna let him know,/Stomp, push, shove, mush, fuck Bush,/Until they bring our troops home.” Commented Kerry: “I heard Eminem on Saturday Night Live last night. I heard the song. . . . I like it.”

Emblematic of the role of the entertainment industry was the release of Michael Moore’s movie *Fahrenheit 9/11*. Moore had first gained public attention in the mid-1980’s when he was fired after only a few months as editor of the leftist glossy, *Mother Jones*. The

publishers said he had failed to perform his duties, but Moore insisted the reason was his refusal to publish a dispatch from Nicaragua containing criticisms of the Sandinista government. Any such criticism, he asserted, would play into the hands of President Reagan and was in any case probably false.

As a film-maker, Moore has eased away from doctrinaire pro-Sandinism to eclectic anti-Americanism. Bin Laden, he suggests, should really be called “USA-ma,” since “we trained him to be a terrorist,” just as we financed the Taliban. The Bush family is in cahoots with the bin Ladens, and invaded Afghanistan in search of profits for American oil companies. Not only is there no terrorist threat, but Iraq before the U.S. invasion was a serene country that “had never attacked or threatened to attack the United States . . . [and] never murdered a single American.” Today, “the Iraqis who have risen up against the occupation are not ‘insurgents’ or ‘terrorists’ or ‘The Enemy.’ They are the REVOLUTION, the Minutemen, and their numbers will grow—and they will win.”

There is, in Moore’s universe, only one real threat to the world:

I agree with the NRA when they say, “Guns don’t kill people; people kill people,” except I would alter that to say, “Guns don’t kill people, Americans kill people.” We’re the only country that does this, and we do it on a personal level in our neighborhoods and within our families and our schools, and we do it on a global level.

It is easy to see from this why Moore should have become the darling of Europeans who hate America—he

Liz | [Email](#) | [Homepage](#) | **01.02.05 - 12:36 am** | <#>

Liz, am I supposed to care what some right wing freak thinks?

Neither Democrats nor Michael Moore hate America. It is just the usual tiresome right wing spin.

As for Hollywood, millions of people in the so-called 'red states' happen to go to their movies. Again, more right wing B.S.

It's not my fault if you want to quote B.S, but I will respond to it and point it out.

Adam T | [Email](#) | [Homepage](#) | **01.02.05 - 12:53 am** | <#>

Liz: I agree 100% with your run down on why the democrats lost. They have become a party filled with hatred for the president and America haters which explains their embrace of Michael Moore.

Adam T you are wrong. Movie going has been on the decline for a number of years now.

Larry in Nevada | Email | Homepage | **01.02.05 - 1:02 am** | <#>

Thank you Larry.

Adam the things I wrote are all factional. This is what the democratic party has become and it is very dissappointing.

Can you refute anything that I have said?

Liz | Email | Homepage | **01.02.05 - 1:05 am** | <#>

Liz you know you are right. Just look at the things the Democrat party did and try to do this past election.

Talking down the troops and the War.

Encouraging Americas enemies

Talking down the economy

Getting courts to destroy marriage

Scaring young voters with lies about the draft.

Embracing Michael Moore and the other sick, immoral hollywood liberals.

Taking the money of the America hater and money changer George Soros.

Comparing the President to Hilter.

Trying to bring down Bush with false documents produce by the liberals over at CBS.

Trying to split America apart with John Edwards nonsense about "Two Americas"

Tainting the exit polls with liberals and then leaking them to far-left bloggers to try to sway the election.

Liz I can go on and on and on.

Putting up a traitor and war protester that called American soldiers baby killers.

Embracing the far left lunacy of Howard Dean.

Spend 1 billion dollers to smear and slander the President of the United States.

Ted Kennedy saying Bush whet to war for his own political gain.

Al Gore saying Bush betrayed this country.

Accusing our soldiers in Iraq of war crimes with the foolishness about Abu Grab.

Larry in Nevada | [Email](#) | [Homepage](#) | **01.02.05 - 1:17 am** | <#>

You Democrats need to find a better way to bring your party together because hate never works.

Kyle | [Email](#) | [Homepage](#) | **01.02.05 - 1:20 am** | <#>

All factional, Liz?

No offence, but suggesting that we, as Democrats, are traitors is nonsense.

The problem that the Democrats have been having is that we got bogged down in all these centrist focus groups in D.C. Our philosophy went from "We're for the Little Guy" to "Screw the Little Guy if it makes Us Look Moderate." When we took economic issues off the table, it allowed the far right to put abortion and gay marriage on the table.

Now, there are some who want us to move to the right. The Republicans didn't get to where they are now by going to the left, after 1992, they went to the right, and they one.

Unless it's being delivered by someone like Bill Clinton or maybe Barack Obama, the DLC's message doesn't work.

And, as the Dems go farther right, it will only force the GOP to the right, and that will leave the Dems in the permanent minority, as a pale clone of the Republican Party.

Just my thoughts on the matter.

PROUD DEM | [Email](#) | [Homepage](#) | **01.02.05 - 1:25 am** | <#>

And you need to get in touch with people. If I was running for office, even high offices such as Senator or Governor, I would hold backyard bbq's, ask my supporters to hold "Elect Kyle" themed block parties and show up at them, eat at fast food restaurants, wear tee shirts and sandals, ect.

Kyle | [Email](#) | [Homepage](#) | **01.02.05 - 1:26 am** | <#>

Larry:

We never bashed the troops.

Are you trying to deny that Abu Gharib never even happened?

Seems to me that you're the sort of person who thinks that the Elephant is God, and GWB is HIS phropheet.

How's it going, Kyle?

PROUD DEM | Email | [Homepage](#) | **01.02.05 - 1:27 am** | <#>

Don't mind if we take your advice, Kyle?

PROUD DEM | Email | [Homepage](#) | **01.02.05 - 1:28 am** | <#>

Guten tag PD, hows it going bro? Things are fine with me, just hanging around the house doing nothing.

Kyle | [Email](#) | [Homepage](#) | **01.02.05 - 1:30 am** | <#>

I just may do that in 10 years then.

PROUD DEM | Email | [Homepage](#) | **01.02.05 - 1:31 am** | <#>

Just hanging out too. Finishing up last minute homework and all.

Always busy.

PROUD DEM | Email | [Homepage](#) | **01.02.05 - 1:32 am** | <#>

Abu Gharib was blown out of way out of porportion b/c the liberals and the media thought that it would hurt Bush.

And yes the democrats did bash the troops, especially when they made Michael Moore there guest of honor at there convention.

Larry in Nevada | Email | [Homepage](#) | **01.02.05 - 1:33 am** | <#>

Bloody exhausting.

Happy 2005.

PROUD DEM | Email | [Homepage](#) | 01.02.05 - 1:33 am | <#>

PD, still planning to run for Governor?

Kyle | [Email](#) | [Homepage](#) | 01.02.05 - 1:35 am | <#>

Moore never bashed the troops either, Larry.

Abu Gharib was a serious matter. Our troops are supposed to be above that sort of the thing.

You sound like the sort of people who say the Holocaust is blown out of proportion.

You seem to be a fine example of simian evolution gone awry, Larry.

Always complaining, even when you win. And paranoid as well. Too much Limbaugh and Savage, I reckon.

PROUD DEM | Email | [Homepage](#) | 01.02.05 - 1:36 am | <#>

Still leaning that way, Kyle.

Either that or Congress. I would love to take Rick Larsen's place one fine day.

Your running for council still, right?

PROUD DEM | Email | [Homepage](#) | 01.02.05 - 1:38 am | <#>

Nope, not running anymore. A ton of reasons why. I am planning for a state house run in 2006 when I am 19 years old. Running against Brian Blake, who is by far the most liberal state house member our dist has had in a decade.

Kyle | [Email](#) | [Homepage](#) | 01.02.05 - 1:41 am | <#>

Well, I shouldn't be saying this then, but good luck just the same.

The ledge would be a good place for me to go too. Mabye we'll see each other there one fine session, lol.

PROUD DEM | Email | [Homepage](#) | **01.02.05 - 1:43 am** | <#>

I should say I will be 19 by the time the election comes around in 2006, as I will be 18 for part of 2006.

Kyle | [Email](#) | [Homepage](#) | **01.02.05 - 1:44 am** | <#>

PROUD do not start with that foolish anti-sematic ruse your trying to play.

Abu Gharib has nothing to do with the Holocaust, nobody was killed or gas at Abu Gharib

The liberals made an issue out of it b/c they thought it would hurt Bush clear and simple.

Larry in Nevada | Email | [Homepage](#) | **01.02.05 - 1:44 am** | <#>

That'd be cool PD. Too bad you werent going to Olympia for the inaug for Governor on the 12th, I hope to go and am 65% sure I will. All I need to some fake excuse to get out of school.

Kyle | [Email](#) | [Homepage](#) | **01.02.05 - 1:46 am** | <#>

Kyle buddy,

I would suggest you live Washington state when you get the chance.

After the installation of Pretender Gregoire that state is going nowhere fast.

Heres an interesting fact. Washington hasn't grown at all in 20 years according to the U.S census.

So kyle you will be with good company by being one of the thousands that leave Washington for redder and better pastures

Larry in Nevada | Email | [Homepage](#) | **01.02.05 - 1:47 am** | <#>

sorry i ment leave kyle

Larry in Nevada | Email | [Homepage](#) | **01.02.05 - 1:48 am** | <#>

Just say that you have urgent business to take care of in Olympia with the government.

Well, see y'all later.

CLARK/? 08!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!

PROUD DEM | Email | [Homepage](#) | **01.02.05 - 1:50 am** | <#>

Larry in Nevada makes Michael Moore look like a timid, overcautious, painfully balanced, thumb-sucking pundit.

For example, throwing out wild unsubstantiated and unprovable assertions about salting the exit polls with liberals or that John Kerry was a traitor.

That's why I never listen to talk radio.

Even the superior, preachy tone of "All Things Considered" drives me crazy. And that tone comes almost directly from KPFA-fm in Berkeley (Pacifica stations) who drove me crazy when they called the National Liberation Front [Viet Cong] and the GRUNK [Khmer National Unified Royal Govt] by their full formal titles but called their adversaries names like "Lon Nol puppet troops". (Not that everything about KPFA is bad; I once narrated a summer's worth of Berkeley City Council meetings for it.)

Maybe my journalistic training makes me hypersensitive, but I like to read something more than pure partisan passion.

By the way, I know Josh Muravchik from the days when he was National Secretary of the Young Peoples Socialist League (YPSL). However, Josh wrote a piece about ten or fifteen years ago explaining why he has definitely abandoned socialism.

Dem Socialist Dave | Email | [Homepage](#) | **01.02.05 - 1:51 am** | <#>

Sorry Larry, I have a bond with Washington that cant be broken except by Oregon. I wouldnt want to live in anyother areas but Western Washington or Northwestern Oregon. Besides, Gregoire might not be Governor long. If a re-vote happens, she will lose. Check it out, www.revotewa.com.

Kyle | [Email](#) | [Homepage](#) | **01.02.05 - 1:52 am** | <#>

By the way, Liz, do you have a simple link to Muravchik's piece, so we can finish

reading it on our own?

Thanks.

Dem Socialist Dave | Email | [Homepage](#) | **01.02.05 - 1:54 am** | <#>

Dave, Moore is a sick less then a man and is a traitor to America and freedom.

Kyle | [Email](#) | [Homepage](#) | **01.02.05 - 1:55 am** | <#>

Here:

<http://www.commentarymagazine.co...m/ A11901023.htm>

Liz | Email | [Homepage](#) | **01.02.05 - 1:56 am** | <#>

I take that back, there are parts of Eastern Washington I wouldnt mind, such as the Tri-Cities or Yakima. Just not enough trees.

Kyle | [Email](#) | [Homepage](#) | **01.02.05 - 1:57 am** | <#>

Hey Liz, whats up? I havent talked to you forever. Hows things in Senator Warner's office? He going to run for President in 2008?

Kyle | [Email](#) | [Homepage](#) | **01.02.05 - 1:58 am** | <#>

"uuuhhhh, do you know what "Chicken Hawk" means in pervert slang?"

Yes I do, but I probably won't post the answer

Moderate Mark | Email | [Homepage](#) | **01.02.05 - 2:03 am** | <#>

Magical secrets of HTML tags revealed !

Yes, kids, you can create a fully automatic, clickable, professional looking hyperlink right here on this blog in the security and privacy of your own home!

No muss! No fuss! No special tools or special training!

And your friends and enemies won't have to do all that messy, dangerous, uncertain

cutting-and-pasting of your precious, delicate, hard-to-find URL's onto a browser window without an address bar. No more clicking "Link" and wondering where in the world it will lead. They'll be both very impressed and very grateful. And you'll have the satisfaction of knowing how much likelier they'll be to actually visit the site you want them to.

Just follow these E-Z tips from a complete non-techie who learned it from scratch on another message board (Secretarythemovie.com, RIP)

First, find (but don't type) the "less-than" or French open-single-quotation mark above the comma on your keyboard:

<

Next, print out the following characters exactly:

<a href="

(Don't forget the double English quotation marks ")

Third, print out your URL, including http:// at the beginning.

Fourth, follow the URL directly (no breaks) with these two characters:

">

[If those don't both print out properly, they were English double quote followed by the French single close-quote (or "greater than") found above the period or full-stop on your keyboard.]

It is **very important** to close the URL with those double quote marks. Otherwise the hyperlink will continue forever into your message and beyond.

Fifth, enter a title for your hyperlink. If the link is short you can just repeat it (e.g., <http://www.fec.gov>) if you'd like, but a long hyperlink should not be reprinted here because it will stretch out the whole blog sideways beyond the width of one screen. However, it's usually better just to put in an explanatory title like "FCC", "Electoral College", "Montana Secretary of State", "Democrats Abroad", "National Review", etc. (quotation marks not needed).

Sixth, last, and also **very important**, close your title with these exact characters

If you don't close the link this way, then all the rest of your text will be underlined in blue or red and form an extension of the clickable hyperlink.

¶ So, what will it look like in the "Post a Comment" box? It should look like this, if I did everything right.

Federal Election Commission

which will appear on the blog as:

[Federal Election Commission](http://www.fec.gov)

which should be a clickable hyperlink.

Of course, I may need to adjust this because of some silly oversight. To err is human.

Dem Socialist Dave | Email | [Homepage](#) | **01.02.05 - 2:32 am** | <#>

[Gee, only one mistake, corrected below. Guess I must be human.]

Magical secrets of HTML tags revealed !

Yes, kids, you can create a fully automatic, clickable, professional looking hyperlink right here on this blog in the security and privacy of your own home!

No muss! No fuss! No special tools or special training!

And your friends and enemies won't have to do all that messy, dangerous, uncertain cutting-and-pasting of your precious, delicate, hard-to-find URL's onto a browser window without an address bar. No more clicking "Link" and wondering where in the world it will lead. They'll be both very impressed and very grateful. And you'll have the satisfaction of knowing how much likelier they'll be to actually visit the site you want them to.

Just follow these E-Z tips from a complete non-techie who learned it from scratch on another message board (Secretarythemovie.com, RIP)

First, find (but don't type) the "less-than" or French open-single-quotation mark above the comma on your keyboard:

<

Next, print out the following characters exactly:

<a href="

(Don't forget the double English quotation marks ")

Third, print out your URL, including http:// at the beginning.

Fourth, follow the URL directly (no breaks) with these two characters:

">

[If those don't both print out properly, they were English double quote followed by the French single close-quote (or "greater than") found above the period or full-stop on your keyboard.]

It is **very important** to close the URL with those double quote marks. Otherwise the hyperlink will continue forever into your message and beyond.

Fifth, enter a title for your hyperlink. If the link is short you can just repeat it (e.g., <http://www.fec.gov>) if you'd like, but a long hyperlink should not be reprinted here because it will stretch out the whole blog sideways beyond the width of one screen. However, it's usually better just to put in an explanatory title like "FCC", "Electoral College", "Montana Secretary of State", "Democrats Abroad", "National Review", etc. (quotation marks not needed).

Sixth, last, and also **very important**, close your title with these exact characters

If you don't close the link this way, then all the rest of your text will be underlined in blue or red and form an extension of the clickable hyperlink.

¶ So, what will it look like in the "Post a Comment" box? It should look like this, if I did everything right.

Federal Election Commission

which will appear on the blog as:

[Federal Election Commission](http://www.fec.gov)

which should be a clickable hyperlink.

Of course, I may need to adjust this because of some silly oversight. To err is human.

Thanks, Liz.

[Josh Muravchik's article](#), from which Liz posted excerpts above, is long but worth reading, and has some telling points, although I, of course, think it has many false assumptions and false conclusions.

If you believe (as I don't) that the Democrats were wrong to turn against the Vietnam War, then you're more likely to agree with Josh Muravchik. If you think (as I don't) that the U.S. should have stayed away from intervening in the Balkans, you're less likely to agree with him. Some of his attacks on trendy urban Hollywood and limousine liberalism are justified, some are just silly and tiresome.

But his analysis of the election returns and polls is much sounder than [Fred Barnes in the Wall St. Journal opinion piece I posted](#) much earlier above. Where Barnes sees the establishment of Republican hegemony as pretty well completed, Muravchik sees a clear Republican tendency but nothing definite. He's much more cautious about the "moral values" question in the exit polls. And I can't really disagree with his conclusion:

Taken together, these numbers suggest that the problem for the Democrats goes beyond voters who choose to put other issues ahead of economic ones. The problem is whether the party can win even on economic issues. While Bush suffered from the mediocre performance of the economy during his first term (Presidents always get more blame or credit for this than they deserve), and while the Democrats retain the cachet of being the party of the common man, support for their economic policies has been leaching away.

This erosion is something that the Democrats, who already trail Republicans on issues of national security and values, cannot afford. If it continues, and unless the party can fulfill Cherny's goal of developing some new vision, they will win the presidency or Congress only when scandal or recession or defeat in war lays the Republicans low. The rest of the time, the GOP will reign. If this is the abyss into which the pundits peered, little wonder that they became so deranged. Hard, brutish times indeed.

In other words, the campaign just past showed that you can't win without a message. Bush's message in 2000 may have been subliminal rather than explicit, but in 2004 he seemed to be the man with clear ideas and Kerry the question-mark. And the comment made after Reagan's victory applies to Democrats now as it did then: that we're used to

being outspent by the Republicans, but we can't handled being outthought by them as well.

Dem Socialist Dave | [Email](#) | [Homepage](#) | **01.02.05 - 3:31 am** | <#>

hey all, my blog is updated

Daniel | [Email](#) | [Homepage](#) | **01.02.05 - 9:13 am** | <#>

Hey, KYDem: William Saffire just predicted that the Dems would nominate Richardson/Bayh in '08. Granted, he also predicted that the Repubs would nominate McCain/Rice and that there would be no problems at all in Iraq after the elections, so take it with a grain of salt.

VCUMIKE | [Email](#) | [Homepage](#) | **01.02.05 - 10:02 am** | <#>

thanks mike

Daniel | [Email](#) | [Homepage](#) | **01.02.05 - 10:57 am** | <#>

Why would Bayh take the number 2 spot? I don't know about him, but I'd rather be a Senator than VP.

paul falduto | [Email](#) | [Homepage](#) | **01.02.05 - 11:40 am** | <#>

I hope Saffire is right that there will be no problems in Iraq after the elections, but I think he is being wildly optomistic.

paul falduto | [Email](#) | [Homepage](#) | **01.02.05 - 11:41 am** | <#>

Paul, it was bizarre, he rattled off all of the reasons that Iraq SHOULD have a civil war as if they were positives: "Well, you've got all the Kurds in the North there, and the Shiites will be in control and the Sunnis are out of power, so I think it will be OK." Does he think the Kurds won't want their own country? Or that the Shiia won't try for closer Iran ties? Or that the Sunnis are going to sit back and take whatever gets thrown their way?

As for Bayh, I think he's a good Senator (His father is one of my political heroes) but I'm not as convinced as Daniel that he's the way to go. I think he's on the boring/uninspiring side. But we'll see if he really wants it. People think that Clinton won because of his policy positions, but a lot of it was his personality and his speaking ability. I can't think of anyone who has that combination on the political stage, except for maybe Richardson.

VCUMIKE | [Email](#) | [Homepage](#) | **01.02.05 - 12:25 pm** | <#>

Safires prediction of a Bayh/Richardson ticket is reasonable. However, a McCain/Condi ticket is NOT! McCain has been quite critical of the administration. I'd say theres a better chance McCain takes Dean than Condi. She also doesn't have the job of senator/or Governor... Maybe McCain Fitzgerald is more realistic... The former IL senator... I think he might steal Rod B's job too.

Evan Rocking Out | [Email](#) | [Homepage](#) | **01.02.05 - 1:22 pm** | <#>

"People think that Clinton won because of his policy positions, but a lot of it was his personality and his speaking ability."

That is totally true. Being president is not so much your policies (because does it really matter?) but how you connect with people and if you inspire them.

Take our two greatest presidents in history. Abe Lincoln and George Washington. You could not have two more opposite personalities. GW was practical, concrete, level, and organized. AL was fanciful, abstract, poetic, and dissheveled. But one thing they both had in common was an ability to connect with others and inspire people (in different ways, mind you, but still). That is almost a prerequisite for the presidency

Moderate Mark | [Email](#) | [Homepage](#) | **01.02.05 - 1:54 pm** | <#>

William Safire has been nothing more than an insane conspiracy theorist for years. He is the Michael Moore of the right, except he isn't even at least funny or entertaining.

Adam T | [Email](#) | [Homepage](#) | **01.02.05 - 2:04 pm** | <#>

2006 Race of the Day

New York Senate

currently held by Democrat

The main event of the 2006 Election Year will probably be this race with national implications regarding the 2008 Presidential race. Both parties are likely to feature candidates who have Presidential ambitions. The winner of this race could catapult themselves to the top of the heap going into 2007 while the loser may see those dreams come to an end.

The 2006 race for Governor of New York runs in conjunction to this race in many ways in regards to potential Republican candidates, etc. so much of this may be repeated from what I said about that race yesterday.

Incumbent Senator and former First Lady Hillary Rodham Clinton will be running for a second term in New York. She will be extremely well funded and also by her very presence will cause tons of Republican money to be put into the race to defeat her through 527 groups and the eventual Republican nominee.

Pretty simply, if Hillary wins reelection, it is hard to conceive of her being stopped for the 2008 Presidential nomination. If she loses, then her career, and the legacy of the Clintons takes a major hit and the Democrat race for President is wide open.

Most Republicans would love nothing better than to see her lose and go down to defeat, especially in a very Democrat dominated state on the federal level. While others may almost be willing to accept her being reelected as her Presidential candidacy is thought by them to be likely to go down to defeat and hurt Democrats nationwide.

More and more Democrats are now starting to whisper about Hillary being unelectable and may even start to realize that the only way she can be derailed would be a loss in 2006.

Since New York is so Democrat leaning, Clinton would be the favorite against many potential candidates. However, there are two big names that would give her quite a challenge.

One option is for Governor George Pataki to run for the Senate instead of seeking reelection. He of course has the experience of having been elected statewide three times and would have the Republican and Conservative Parties united behind him in an effort to defeat Hillary. Pataki may decide this is his best option as some feel it would be an uphill race for reelection as Governor and if he beats Hillary, he would be an immediate GOP hero going into the 2008 sweepstakes.

Another possibility, and slightly more likely, would be the candidacy of former NYC Mayor and national celebrity Rudy Giuliani.

Rudy had intended to run for the Senate in 2000 before marital and health issues caused him to take a pass. Now, with a new wife, and cancer free, he might be yearning for such a race and his popularity might just be enough to beat Hillary.

Giuliani would of course lose the New York City vote but would do better than any other Republican would. He would generate huge margins in the New York City suburbs, leaving Upstate New York as the deciding factor.

Upstate New York

Part 2

Upstate New York is somewhat conservative leaning and they do not have a history of taking kindly to New York City politicians but Hillary as seen as such a divisive figure and in the post 9/11 world, Giuliani has cultivated an image as “America’s Mayor”, that for a time it was almost hard to imagine him not being elected to any office in New York. Rudy may also see himself as more of a Chief Executive type and could run for Governor of the state, which is traditionally a better launching ground for a White House bid.

The scandal regarding Giuliani’s former protégé Bernie Kerik taking his name out of consideration for Secretary of Homeland Security might hurt Rudy temporarily, especially regarding his Presidential hopes, but in New York, something like that could be quickly forgotten if he were to make the race against Hillary in the ultimate “battle of the titans.”

If Pataki and Giuliani both decide to not run for the Senate and Colin Powell does not have a change of heart, Clinton’s prospects improve. She might then see herself facing extremely wealthy candidates from the private sector such as Don Marron, upstate Congressman John Sweeney, or perhaps someone like Lt. Governor Mary Donahue, if Pataki retires all together.

By this time next year, we should know whether or not Hillary Clinton is a solid favorite to win reelection or if she is in for the race of the year against Pataki or especially Giuliani.

The 2008 campaign will not be able to truly start until this piece of the 2006 puzzle is answered.

This Bears game is ridiculous.

In the opening drive, the Bears score a quick touchdown and go up 7-0 and knowing that the Packers would pull their starters after the first quarter, it looked like the Bears might actually beat Green Bay in Chicago for the first time since 1993.

However, lo and behold, the Packers now lead the game 28-7.

This season for the Bears cannot be over fast enough but I am not getting too down because the reelection of President Bush last year was enjoyable enough to overcome all sports disappointments.

Corey | [Email](#) | [Homepage](#) | **01.02.05 - 2:11 pm** | <#>

Liz, find me one full quote, not taken out of context of Michael Moore saying anything that shows he "hates America"?

The Republicans are excellent at finding a meme, sticking with it and, even when they have no evidence to back it up, getting their supporters to fall for it, believe it and mouth it. That they can do this so much better than the Democrats is, to my mind, the number one reason why Bush was reelected.

It's the exact same thing that Saddam Hussein was behind September 11, or that he was trying to build up his WMD. Both are out and out lies, yet most Bush supporters believe them.

There was also another poll reported on by Robert Samuelson in Newsweek that showed that just 4% of Democrats 'hated' George W. Bush. So, that shoots the B.S article that you posted right out of the water already.

Adam T | [Email](#) | [Homepage](#) | **01.02.05 - 2:12 pm** | <#>

Corey, you neglected to mention Hillary Clinton has an approval rating among New Yorkers in the low to mid 60's.

She would crush George Pataki and all the polls show that.

Adam T | [Email](#) | [Homepage](#) | **01.02.05 - 2:15 pm** | <#>

Dem Socialist Dave "In other words, the campaign just past showed that you can't win without a message. Bush's message in 2000 may have been subliminal rather than explicit, but in 2004 he seemed to be the man with clear ideas and Kerry the question-mark."

What 'clear ideas' does Bush have exactly?

1. Invading a country with no plan to get out of it?
2. Implementing a new social security plan with no idea how to finance it?
3. Lowering the standard of living of Americans by lowering the dollar while all the while claiming to support a strong dollar policy?

Adam T | [Email](#) | [Homepage](#) | **01.02.05 - 2:19 pm** | <#>

Bush has no real plan for ANYTHING! No plan for peace, no plan for the economy, no plan for America and the world. The reason Kerry is not president, I say again, is because Florida was stolen TWICE in a row.

But whatever! Who gives a flying fuck about democracy anymore. Anyone on here who does not support a recount, revote, or at least an investigation, doesn't give a damn about democratic ideals.

Ragnar Danashold | [Email](#) | [Homepage](#) | **01.02.05 - 2:29 pm** | <#>

Adam, I did say "seemed". The substance behind many of his notions is such extreme dogmatic crackpot libertarian or corporate fantasy that he couldn't elaborate it on the campaign trail.

On the other hand, just as the idea of gay civil unions was considered a piece of Vermont craziness ten or fifteen years ago and is now the mainstream option, Bush & co. know that pushed correctly and forcefully enough, he can put many off-the-wall reactionary phantasies on the table: e.g. privatizing Social Security or funding religion through taxes.

Dem Socialist Dave | [Email](#) | [Homepage](#) | **01.02.05 - 2:41 pm** | <#>

Anyway, my point was that Kerry seemed to be clueless.

He happened to have, as I understand it, a limited but practical health-care reform proposal somewhat similar to John Chafee's middle-road plan of 1993-4, but that got completely obscured in the campaign.

On Iraq he was inscrutable. What would you do differently? I would have started someplace else.

Dem Socialist Dave | [Email](#) | [Homepage](#) | **01.02.05 - 2:44 pm** | <#>

Dem Socialist Dave, very good point. You did say "seemed".

I overlooked that. We are pretty much in agreement. The Republican Party is much better at pushing memes, and getting their sheep, errrr I mean supporters, to fall for it.

Adam T | [Email](#) | [Homepage](#) | **01.02.05 - 2:48 pm** | <#>

Even with Kerrys half-ass and hazey messeges, he still rightfully won. Jesus the Profit, RECOUNT/REVOTE/INVESTIGATE FLORIDA! ANYTHING!!!

Ragnar Danashold | Email | [Homepage](#) | 01.02.05 - 2:55 pm | <#>

I have to run now, but there are definite conservative, libertarian and reactionary ideas out there; they've been in neo-con and libertarian periodicals like the Wall St. Journal, Nat'l Review, Manhattan Journal, The Public Interest, The Freeman, Reason and Commentary for several decades now.

It's just that most of them are still off the wall. Invading Iraq would have been on my list; some of them still want to invade Iran. Now with exactly the wrong constellation of forces and exactly the wrong Iranians in power, that might conceivably become necessary for some incredibly-pressing reason some time in the future, but it would be such a ghastly proposition for both countries and for the world that it shouldn't be thought of as anything more than one of the ultimate Nightmare Scenarios.

Some of the nuclear theology (missile to missile defense, staying out of non-proliferation treaties) is straight out of Dr Strangelove but still a going concern on large parts of the national-security Right.

So who knows what's on the agenda?

Dem Socialist Dave | Email | [Homepage](#) | 01.02.05 - 3:00 pm | <#>

It was Bayh/Richardson not Richardson/Bayh.

Bill has too much baggage.

Daniel | [Email](#) | [Homepage](#) | 01.02.05 - 3:06 pm | <#>

Gods, are we fucked. With Dubya in control of Americas neuclear, chemical, biological, and hell, even our atomic weapons, no one should feel safe.

Ragnar Danashold | Email | [Homepage](#) | 01.02.05 - 3:06 pm | <#>

Daniel/KYDem,

What about Dachele running for prez? I'm afraid I don't know a lot about center-dems, but I think he's a centerist, right?

Ragnar Danashold | Email | [Homepage](#) | **01.02.05 - 3:08 pm** | <#>

William Safire hasn't been right about anything in at least 10 years. Who cares what he is thinking now?

Adam T | [Email](#) | [Homepage](#) | **01.02.05 - 3:15 pm** | <#>

I just want to take this time to say that California Congressman Bob Matsui died on January 1st at the age of 63. Rest in Peace.

Sir Walter | Email | [Homepage](#) | **01.02.05 - 3:22 pm** | <#>

Corey, I agree with you that if HRC loses in 2006, she will be out of the running for the 2008 Pres nomination. But the converse is not true: she is not "unstoppable" for the nomination in 2008 if she wins in 2006. She is very popular among Dems, but that doesn't mean we want her as our nominee. I think the 2008 nominations for both parties are wide open.

paul falduto | [Email](#) | [Homepage](#) | **01.02.05 - 3:25 pm** | <#>

Daniel, not only is Bayh as exciting as today's Packer-Bear game, he is a very fuzzy politician who avoids taking stands either way on most major issues. Why do you think he wins 60%+ in IN?

paul falduto | [Email](#) | [Homepage](#) | **01.02.05 - 3:27 pm** | <#>

May the Gods of Light watch over you, Bob. Men like you are few in the world.

If it's between McCain and HRC, I'm voting for McCain. That's all there is to it.

Ragnar Danashold | Email | [Homepage](#) | **01.02.05 - 3:29 pm** | <#>

The Democrats have a long list of presidential contenders for 2008. Of course, some of them have to get reelected in 2006 first.

Governors:

1. Janet Napolitano, Arizona
2. Rod Blagojevich, Illinois
3. Tom Vilsack, Iowa
4. Bill Richardson, New Mexico

- 5.Mike Easley, North Carolina
- 6.Brad Henry, Oklahoma
- 7.Ed Rendell, Pennsylvania
- 8.Phil Bredesen, Tennessee
- 9.Mark Warner, Virginia
- 10.Jim Doyle, Wisconsin

Senators

- 1.Blanche Lincoln, Arkansas
- 2.Chris Dodd, Connecticut
- 3.Joe Biden, Delaware
- 4.Richard Durbin, Illinois
- 5.Evan Bayh, Indiana
- 6.Mary Landrieu, Louisiana
- 7.John Kerry, Massachusetts
- 8.Debbie Stabenow, Michigan
- 9.Ben Nelson, Nebraska
- 10.Chuck Schumer, New York
- 11.Hillary Clinton, New York
- 12.Maria Cantwell, Washington
- 13.Russ Feingold, Wisconsin

Other

- 1.Wes Clark, Arkansas
- 2.John Edwards, North Carolina
- 3.Al Gore, Tennessee
- 4.Howard Dean, Vermont

Adam T | [Email](#) | [Homepage](#) | **01.02.05 - 3:46 pm** | <#>

I'll say it again: Dems need to take a good look at Feingold. Unlike Bayh, he gets support from conservatives and moderates because of what he DOES, not what he DOESN'T DO.

paul falduto | [Email](#) | [Homepage](#) | **01.02.05 - 3:57 pm** | <#>

Matsui died?

KYDem | [Email](#) | [Homepage](#) | **01.02.05 - 3:59 pm** | <#>

The latest poll put Pataki 22% behind Hillary for 2006. Considering he was only 12% behind Eliot Spitzer, he would be wise to stay in that race. Or maybe somehow he could opt out of the race soon and make it seem like 12 years was enough (opposed to being forced out of a 4th term by low poll numbers). Then he may have a longshot chance at

the 2008 Presidential nomination, but only if Giuliani doesn't run.

Drayton | Email | Homepage | **01.02.05 - 4:00 pm** | <#>

I thought the Packer-Bears game was exiting, but then again I live in Wisconsin and am a packer fan.

Sir Walter | Email | Homepage | **01.02.05 - 4:05 pm** | <#>

We really should stop speculating on 2008. I mean, after the 2000 election, who would have thought there would be a Kerry-Edwards ticket, or how many people had heard of Howard Dean or Wesley Clark. Who would have thought Lautenberg and Mondale would run for the Senate again? Though the polls show Hillary and McCain as frontrunners, things can change over the next three years.

Sir Walter | Email | Homepage | **01.02.05 - 4:13 pm** | <#>

Here's the WHOLE story on NC. The BOE (That is appointed by the sitting Governor) saw that Cobb couldn't win the recount using the votes already cast. So, they initially decided 4-1 (That means that one Republican voted for it as a compromise) that instead of revoting all of the voters that had their votes thrown out, they'd let all the Carterette County voters that didn't vote be able to vote along with them. Thus, giving Cobb a chance to win an election he lost.

This was obviously unfair and was thrown out by a Superior Court Judge.

In NC it takes FOUR votes on the BOE to order any kind of a new election, so instead of following the rules, the Democrats got this "new" Statewide election by voting on amending the order for a new Carterette Election that passed as a compromise (That should prove that you never should try to work with Democrats, especially in the South. You always get screwed...just ask "Speaker" Morgan)

This new election should be thrown out as well.

As for the idiot calling Beverly Lake a "douchebag partisan", check out and see who he appointed to run the AOC. You'd never find a Democrat doing that the other way around. Obviously, you have no idea what you're talking about.

tarheel | Email | Homepage | **01.02.05 - 4:14 pm** | <#>

I'm not getting the feeling Pataki is planning to run for anything in New York in 2006. His popularity there has dropped considerably since 2002, and his strong partisan campaigning for Bush this year indicates to me he is planning a national campaign, not another statewide campaign in New York. I think it's anyone's guess what Giuliani decides to do. If he doesn't run for the Senate, I think the strongest challenger to Hillary would be Mary Donahue.

Peter | [Email](#) | [Homepage](#) | **01.02.05 - 4:37 pm** | <#>

RIP Bob Matsui, a very good man.

Adam | [Email](#) | [Homepage](#) | **01.02.05 - 5:04 pm** | <#>

Corey, as someone already mentioned, you forget that Hillary is the most popular state-wide elected official in NY. This is due to a combination of factors, including the fact that many expected her to be a showboater, but she has provided excellent constituent service, and kept a lower profile than many expected.

Additionally, no modern Democrat has ever been as popular as Hillary Clinton in Upstate New York. Indeed, Sen. Moynihan, beloved by most New Yorkers, had some close calls Upstate in several elections. You have to remember, Hillary Clinton is the most conservative Democrat in state-wide New York politics in years. She is to the right of Moynihan, Spitzer, Schumer, and Cuomo.

I don't know that I would count on the NYC suburbs to help Rudy. While he is not Bush, I thought one of the most interesting changes in the '04 election was that Kerry's margins in the suburbs were even bigger than Gore's.

Finally, in order to run for President, Pataki not only has to win, he has to win pretty big. I would say that a 10% margin would be best. He cannot run again for Governor, for fear that, even if Spitzer didn't win, he would make it a 51-49 race. Even if Pataki pulled it out with that kind of margin, he could never run for Prez. on it.

If both Pataki and Giuliani pass, Hillary will rake up the biggest margins New York has ever seen.

VCUMIKE | [Email](#) | [Homepage](#) | **01.02.05 - 7:11 pm** | <#>

I'd also point out that Colin Powell has categorically ruled out a run for political office, and did so again today. He will not run in NY.

VCUMIKE | [Email](#) | [Homepage](#) | **01.02.05 - 7:14 pm** | <#>

You have to remember, Hillary Clinton is the most conservative Democrat in state-wide New York politics in years. She is to the right of Moynihan, Spitzer, Schumer, and Cuomo.

Yikes! Remind he never to move to New York!

I remember Chuck Shumer saying something about he wanted to hug president Bush after 9-11, and he casually asented to give 40B.

dudeman5685 | Email | Homepage | **01.02.05 - 7:16 pm** | <#>

Keep on whining and bitching, dear liberals. Elections are won on ideas and not attacks. 2 months since the election and you liberals are still madder than hell. Get over it sweeties because you have 4 years to get your act together.

Anonymous | Email | Homepage | **01.02.05 - 7:17 pm** | <#>

I will say one thing about Hillery--she has indeed kept a surpisingly low profile as Sen.

I expected her to use that office as a pulpit to advance her, and I do mean HER, agenda.

Like she did with the usually non-partisan office of "First Lady"

dudeman5685 | Email | Homepage | **01.02.05 - 7:18 pm** | <#>

RIP, Matsui.

Its funny, I justed notices his name his name looking over Clintons 1992 Conv. speech.

Then he dies.

Wierd how that works out.

dudeman5685 | Email | Homepage | **01.02.05 - 7:20 pm** | <#>

Finally, in order to run for President, Pataki not only has to win, he has to win pretty big.

Notice how many 2008 GOP hopefuls are North Eastern moderates?

Mitt Romney
Pataki
Guiliani.

I like Guiliani myself.

Don't about all his issues, but he turned NYC around and has a charismatic personality.

Just hope that footage of him in Marilyn Monroe drag singing "Happy Birth Day, Mr. President" doesn't surface.

dudeman5685 | [Email](#) | [Homepage](#) | **01.02.05 - 7:23 pm** | <#>

Ya, dudeman, the Clintons gave him a rare blood disorder. Ass.

VCUMIKE | [Email](#) | [Homepage](#) | **01.02.05 - 7:35 pm** | <#>

VCUMIKE, I wasn't making any kind of Conspiracy theory, I saw his name in Clintons speech -- I noticed it because it was Asian-- then a few moments later I get on Yahoo and hes dead.

just odd.

btw, if me fellow Republican are skiddish about Rudy, you can read a largfe slecection of his speechs at his archived Mayors office.

<http://www.ci.nyc.ny.us/html/rwg/>

dudeman5685 | [Email](#) | [Homepage](#) | **01.02.05 - 7:44 pm** | <#>

Does anyone know if Rudy supported the Partial Birth Abortion Ban?

I could vote for a miderately pro-choice person like Kay Baily Hutchinson, but not some one who would go as far a allowing PBA.

dudeman5685 | [Email](#) | [Homepage](#) | **01.02.05 - 7:46 pm** | <#>

Cant conservatives do anything other than call liberals names?

I mean for real...

Illinois-Liberal | [Email](#) | [Homepage](#) | **01.02.05 - 7:52 pm** | <#>

" I could vote for a miderately pro-choice person like Kay Baily Hutchinson, but not some one who would go as far a allowing PBA."

I don't understand why that's relevant. I believe the most important role for the president is commander-in-chief. Who cares what he feels about abortion? This is more a congress-thing than a president-thing

Moderate Mark | [Email](#) | [Homepage](#) | **01.02.05 - 7:54 pm** | <#>

This is more a congress-thing than a president-thing

Congress passed a PBA ban in 96 or 97. Clinton vetoed it.

The web site is pretty extensive. I have a feeling I'm gonna be getting better acquainted with Rudy in the next 4 years.

dudeman5685 | [Email](#) | [Homepage](#) | **01.02.05 - 7:56 pm** | <#>

As for c-in-c--

Rudy had a VERY good record combatting crime in NYC. The more Sharpton hated him, the more the GOP liked him.

But admittedly, police work and the military aren't the same thing.

dudeman5685 | [Email](#) | [Homepage](#) | **01.02.05 - 7:59 pm** | <#>

NYC has 500,000 police officers, that is about the same as the entire Canadian military.

So as mayor of a large city with an out of control crime problem...well, that's close enough I suppose.

dudeman5685 | [Email](#) | [Homepage](#) | **01.02.05 - 8:00 pm** | <#>

Montana is definitely trending dem... could it be a sign that some of the Rocky Mountain states are going to join Washington, Oregon, and California into the dem column as the south moves further to the right?(Just Colorado, Arizona, Nevada, and Montana really at this point...)

Evan Rocking Out | [Email](#) | [Homepage](#) | **01.02.05 - 8:10 pm** | <#>

Montana used to be pretty Democratic. Senate Minority Leader Mike Mansfield was from Montana and saw all the Civil Rights legislation through the Senate in the '60's by breaking the Southern filibuster. He was great.

VCUMIKE | [Email](#) | [Homepage](#) | **01.02.05 - 8:18 pm** | <#>

Montana could also give us a senate victory next year, Evan.

Conrad Burns. This thick-headed fool barely survived 2000 against a then unknown Brain Schweitzer. If AG Mike McGrath or Senate Prez Jon Tester runs, he'll have one hell of a race on his hands.

PROUD DEM | Email | [Homepage](#) | **01.02.05 - 8:23 pm** | <#>

Then all the right wing whites began leaving CA in the 60s for the Rocky Mountain West.

Now, Liberals are leaving congested CA for CO, NV, AZ, and NM. That actually forces people from those states to places like WA.

Interesting cycle, it seems.

PROUD DEM | Email | [Homepage](#) | **01.02.05 - 8:26 pm** | <#>

I'm pretty positive that the Republican nominee will be Bill Frist. All the other candidates being mentioned now are either too liberal (Giuliani, McCain, Hagel, Pataki) or are legislative back benchers (brownback, Allen). Frist has a bit of a charisma defecit, but he will be a very strong nominee because of his legislative skills, his background as a doctor and a humanitarian, and his ideaooogy. Bush and Cheney might even back him. Other than Condi Rice (who I doubt will run), Bill Frist is the best guy the Republicans have to offer

Drayton | Email | [Homepage](#) | **01.02.05 - 8:27 pm** | <#>

PROUD don't count on a liberal, pro gay marriage, anti-gun, anti hunting democrat could win in Montana.

The democrats in Montana benifited from an unpopular Gov In Judy Martz and well over a decade of GOP domanice in the state. Don not confuse it with anything having to do with the national party. Montana is not Oregan or Washington. They call it Gods country for a reason. As of now Burns is safe.

Liz | Email | [Homepage](#) | **01.02.05 - 8:29 pm** | <#>

wlp I already got Guiliani's archived mayoral site bookmarked.

I've also been spening a lot of time doing research on Rick Perry adn Kay Bailly

Hutchinson.

I notices one of Frist's staffers has writen a biography called "The Man Who heals America"

And Mitt Romney has written a book too. Thats always a sign.

dudeman5685 | Email | Homepage | **01.02.05 - 8:32 pm** | <#>

This is the first tme I've even done this, because the upcoming Gov primary fight in TX and the 098 Pres Primary will be the first time I'd be old enough to vote in a primary.

First time I've really had to think about who I'm gonna vote for.

dudeman5685 | Email | Homepage | **01.02.05 - 8:33 pm** | <#>

PROUD don't count on a liberal, pro gay marriage, anti-gun, anti hunting democrat could win in Montana.

I agree I expect MT was fed up with a currrupt R, and elected a centrist Dem.

MT is not the new epicent of Deanism.

dudeman5685 | Email | Homepage | **01.02.05 - 8:35 pm** | <#>

Then all the right wing whites began leaving CA in the 60s for the Rocky Mountain West.

They also moved to central TX-- as if the Austin Progressives weren't isolated enough.

dudeman5685 | Email | Homepage | **01.02.05 - 8:37 pm** | <#>

PROUD you are partly right. States like Nevada, Colorado and Arizona have grown alot in the past 30 years. But you are wrong in your partisan breakdown.

In the case of Colorado and Nevada they use to be very democratic state up until the 1980's. The fact is that whites from California and New England moved out there were and continue to be more conservative then the native residents of those states.

It the hispanic populations that are making Nevada, Colorado and Arizonia to a lesser extent competitive hence the importence for the political parties to carry some measure of the hispanic vote.

Also Washington States hasn't grown in net population in over 20 years.

Liz | [Email](#) | [Homepage](#) | **01.02.05 - 8:37 pm** | <#>

Liz, when was the first time you voted in a primary?

dudeman5685 | [Email](#) | [Homepage](#) | **01.02.05 - 8:41 pm** | <#>

1992

Liz | [Email](#) | [Homepage](#) | **01.02.05 - 8:45 pm** | <#>

Liz, 'bout to go to the new tread, I'll ask here, though.

Tell me you didn't vote for Buchanan?

dudeman5685 | [Email](#) | [Homepage](#) | **01.02.05 - 8:49 pm** | <#>

Forget about Buchanan Liz, did you vote for Kerry?

paul falduto | [Email](#) | [Homepage](#) | **01.02.05 - 8:51 pm** | <#>

If you mean the 1992 Dem primay, paul, it would be Bob KERREY, with an e at the end.

dudeman5685 | [Email](#) | [Homepage](#) | **01.02.05 - 8:52 pm** | <#>

I was wondering who Liz voted for in 2004, not 1992

paul falduto | [Email](#) | [Homepage](#) | **01.02.05 - 8:53 pm** | <#>

I thought about it all last year, but my husband convinced me to vote for the President in the end.

Liz | [Email](#) | [Homepage](#) | **01.02.05 - 8:56 pm** | <#>

Liz, aren't you a Democrat?

paul falduto | [Email](#) | [Homepage](#) | **01.02.05 - 8:57 pm** | <#>

How can anyone who calls themselves a Democrat vote for that man in the White House? You ought to be ashamed to admit it.

paul falduto | [Email](#) | [Homepage](#) | **01.02.05 - 9:03 pm** | <#>

I predict that no dominant GOP will run against Hilary. Pataki, Giuliani, and Powell will all take a pass. I'm guessing her most likely candidate would be Mary Donahue, but Hilary stills wins.

If this happens, I'm fairly certain she'll run for the presidency in 2008. Inside word on the Clintons is that they had a plan for Bill to be pres for 8 years, then Hilary (which I believe was the reason Bill put her in charge of health care, and also why she ran for Senate in 2000). I wouldn't vote for her, mostly because that's too ambitious for my tastes, but I wouldn't rule out her winning. Women make up 52% of the vote, and I saw a poll that they'd favor her for president 60-40

Moderate Mark | [Email](#) | [Homepage](#) | **01.02.05 - 9:03 pm** | <#>

Liz:

Nevada and Colorado were moderate to progressive. Then came the sagebrush/Christian revolt of the 80s and Reagan. By 1998, that region of the nation was so Republican that a joke went that gays were afraid of coming out of the closet there because they would be accused of being Democrats.

Now, things are evening out. In the short term, states like NM, AZ, and NV are good prospects for the Dems. MT is a long term prospect, depending on who the Dems put up in 2008.

And Burns is safe BECAUSE no one has declared their candidacy yet. Schweitzer was just an unknown farmer in 2000, and he almost bested him. Burns only won last time because MT went overwhelmingly to Bush.

PROUD DEM | [Email](#) | [Homepage](#) | **01.02.05 - 9:04 pm** | <#>

Liz, you voted for President Bush????!!

I always knew you were a great person all those months! :)

Very sad news about Congressman Matsui. I just found it out after going to politics1.com.

dudeman, I also have a very odd habit of thinking about someone for no reason and then they die the next day.

Sonny Bono, Chris Farley, and others. I have had discussions with people about songs from the 60s and the 70s that come up for some reason and then the next day, I read that the singer, whom I never even knew the name of had died.

On New Year's, I must have had the weirdest dream I have ever had in my life. Alcohol must really mess up your brain.

I won't get into it but the dream involved Christie Todd Whitman being a relief pitcher for the Chicago Cubs and blowing a game through a fielding error and also Zsa Zsa Gabor was involved somehow.

Corey | [Email](#) | [Homepage](#) | **01.02.05 - 9:28 pm** | <#>

Corey said: "However, I do realize that while Gregoire might be recalled, there is not going to be a re-vote most likely."

Explain to me why she should be re-called....just because you don't like the results doesn't mean somebody should be tossed...it looks like she won based on the system WA uses, live with it and wait until 2008.

spd | [Email](#) | [Homepage](#) | **01.03.05 - 5:59 pm** | <#>

Gregoire should be recalled...

for once I agree with Corey, though Im sure I have more ethical reasons than he. Lets keep the liars and cheats out of the party.

Illinois-Liberal | [Email](#) | [Homepage](#) | **01.03.05 - 6:10 pm** | <#>

Gregoire is neither a liar nor a cheat. She played by the rules and won fair and square.

Adam T | [Email](#) | [Homepage](#) | **01.03.05 - 7:08 pm** | <#>

I did not even say that Gregoire should be recalled. I said she "might" be recalled.

If her supporters can claim that she ascended to office based on system used by WA, I

say fair enough.

She can also be removed from office based on the system used by WA.

What goes around, comes around.

Corey | [Email](#) | [Homepage](#) | **01.03.05 - 10:44 pm** | <#>

Folks, I have reason to believe that the person who has been posting here as Liz, is not in fact the real Liz, who used to post here in 2004.

The internet is a pretty freaky place. One can never know for sure what is going on regarding identity theft and all that.

Corey | [Email](#) | [Homepage](#) | **01.04.05 - 8:34 am** | <#>

Adam's mudslinging has it wholly backwards. King County has 3500 MORE ballots than voters, according to their records of people who voted.

Oops.

King County has become Cook County with more rain.

As far as the North Carolina scenario, when you lose more ballots than the margin of victory, there should be no choice but to hold a new vote in the entire election jurisdiction (a statewide vote in a statewide race).

Nick

NickM | [Email](#) | [Homepage](#) | **01.05.05 - 2:04 am** | <#>

More Ballots counted in King Co. (Wash) ... over 3000 ... than the number of people who voted.!

The number of ballots counted in King County outnumbered the list of voters who voted by 3,539.

<http://seattletimes.nwsources.com...m&date=20050105>

Democrat definition of a fair election?

B | [Email](#) | [Homepage](#) | **01.05.05 - 1:43 pm** | <#>

3539 extra ballots, 400 ballots all filled out in the same handwriting -- that's King County Democrats for ya!

They're well on their way to stealing an election in Washington and they're breaking laws left and right trying to steal the NC Agriculture race.

JohnnyZ | [Email](#) | [Homepage](#) | **01.05.05 - 3:24 pm** | <#>

IDAHO FALLS, Idaho -- A one-time Idaho House of Representatives candidate won't face criminal charges after mailing his Republican primary opponent a fake certificate for one visit to Dr. Jack Kevorkian.

Mike Adams resigned as a precinct committeeman in Bonneville County and will no longer be the county's voting representative on the state GOP central committee.

Bonneville County prosecuting attorney Dane Watkins Jr., said Adams would not face misdemeanor charges of making a threat against a state official because the law requires that a specific threat be made.

Adams challenged Rep. Ann Rydalch in the GOP primary last year, but dropped out of the race a month before the election. Rydalch won the seat by 351 votes. Two months later, Rydalch reported receiving a death threat.

up, them red states

get_a_klu | [Email](#) | [Homepage](#) | **01.07.05 - 7:55 pm** | <#>

Gregoire referred to Rossi's 261-vote victory as a "tie," yet boldly declared victory when she led by 10 votes.

I look forward to yanking that bitch out of office in 2008, if not sooner.

Brent | [Email](#) | [Homepage](#) | **01.09.05 - 5:12 pm** | <#>

The NC Ag race is incredible. Has Mr. Cobb the unelected appointee of Gov. Easley have no shame? It is high time for him to do the honorable thing and concede that he has lost the race. This will save the citizens of NC needless costs. I wonder about the legality of contracts given out the the midway operator of the State Fair that was announced last week. The former Democratic AG Commissioner is in jail because she didn't play ball with those who run the NC Democratic Party. What we are witnessing is the last gasp of

Democratic control in a state that is quickly becoming a state with a growing GOP base.

John | [Email](#) | [Homepage](#) | **01.18.05 - 6:22 pm** | <#>

what the fuck are you talkin bout'

Anonymous | [Email](#) | [Homepage](#) | **10.24.05 - 7:11 pm** | <#>